This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Coming to Grips with the Age of Reason:
An Analysis of the New Evangelical Intellectual
Agenda, 1942-1970

presented by

David Lee Russell

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D degree in Religion

W Fred Graham
Major professor

Date 21 October 1993

COMING TO GRIPS WITH THE AGE OF REASON: AN ANALYSIS OF THE NEW EVANGELICAL INTELLECTUAL AGENDA, 1942 - 1970

By

David Lee Russell

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Arts and Letters, Interdisciplinary

1993

ABSTRACT

COMING TO GRIPS WITH THE AGE OF REASON: AN ANALYSIS OF THE NEW EVANGELICAL INTELLECTUAL AGENDA, 1942-1970

By

David Lee Russell

This study analyzes the intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals from 1942 - 1970. It demonstrates the struggles that the new evangelicals had in their attempt to make evangelicalism intellectually credible. The chapters in this study analyze the intellectual background from which the new evangelicals emerged, the new evangelical repudiation of fundamentalism's lack of concern for intellectual credibility, the fundamentalist opposition to the new evangelicals, the intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals, and the intellectual vision of Edward John Carnell. This study concludes that the new evangelicals made strides forward in their attempt to make evangelicalism intellectually credible, but failed to get beyond the entrapments of the theological issues of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. As a result, the new evangelicals spent most of their intellectual energy on theological issues rather than wider intellectual concerns. The new evangelicals were also sidetracked by a bitter war they had waged with fundamentalists as well as a significant amount of divisiveness between themselves.

This study has analyzed the intellectual contributions of Edward Carnell to new evangelicalism. His correspondence

and his writings have demonstrated that he understood the intellectual needs of evangelicalism in a way that many of his peers failed to comprehend. He understood the necessity of letting go of the negative image of fundamentalism as a first step toward an intellectually relevant new evangelicalism. He understood as well the theological trappings of dispensational premillennialism that was associated with fundamentalism and the need to move beyond them to a much broader, tolerant theological tradition.

The new evangelicals influenced the present generation of evangelical intellectuals, but the overall intellectual focus continued to show more concern for theological issues rather than the wider academic concerns of which the new evangelicals originally set out to pursue.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The most difficult part about expressing gratitude to those who have helped to make a work like this possible is that the author may overlook those who deserve to be recognized. I will try my best not to exclude anyone. First, I would like to thank the members of my committee, Professor Fred Graham, Professor David Bailey, and Professor Marvin Grandstaff for putting up with me through the long haul of my study at Michigan State. I would also like to thank Professor Justin Kestenbaum, Professor Michael Sedlak, and Professor Norman Pollack for teaching me how to study history with a passion. I am grateful for their scholarly examples.

I would like to express a special degree of gratitude to the many librarians and archivists who helped me find my way around the dusty catacombs for valuable materials. First up, I would like to thank Thad Voss of the Buswell Library of Wheaton College; Archivist Robert Schuster of the Billy Graham Center Archives and Library. A major portion of the materials used in this dissertation came from Wheaton College and the Billy Graham Center. I would also like to thank Dr. Stephen Parrish, Librarian of William Tyndale College, for his insightful comments and dialogue regarding

my research into new evangelical history, and for his allowing me to borrow some much needed audio taped sermons of the late Robert T. Ketchum. I would also like to thank the Tyndale Library staff for throwing out a gold mine collection of Sword of the Lord and Christian Beacon periodicals. I was able to retrieve over one thousand of them in two large trash cans; The helpful staff of the library shared by Bethany and Northern Baptist Theological Seminaries, the Library of Calvin College, the Ketchum Library of the Grand Rapids Baptist College and Seminary, the Library of the Moody Bible Institute, the Library and Archives of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, the Library of the University of Detroit Mercy, the Library of the University of Michigan, and the Library of Michigan State University.

Much gratitude goes to Professor Garth Rosell, Director of the Ockenga Institute of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. I met Garth Rosell at a conference at Wheaton College in the spring of 1992 at which time I told him how much I would love to get my hands on the correspondence between Edward John Carnell and Harold John Ockenga. He allowed me to go through a major portion of the massive amount of Ockenga correspondence with Carnell. These letters enhanced my dissertation more than I could have every hope. Thank you, Garth, from the bottom of my heart. The scholarly networking that I was able to achieve while in the midst of my research brought me across the path of Professor Donald

W. Dayton. I have thoroughly enjoyed making his acquaintance and most of all having the opportunity to glean priceless insights from him as we have spent long hours discussing the nature and history of American evangelicalism. He brings to the debate over American evangelicalism the kind of theological and historical savvy often missing in the community of evangelical scholars. My close friends deserve a note of thanks for listening to me bounce around the conclusions of my research: John Marine, of Dove Booksellers, who allowed me to tag along with him on used book buying trips and visits to Chicago, and who is responsible for introducing me to Don Dayton and numerous other scholars. His insights into the pros and cons of American evangelicalism proved to be brilliant and often times frightening. His wit, on top of his intellect, was a shot in the arm when I needed it most. No greater friend for which I could ever ask; Paul Patton my Pastor, mentor, and friend, Al Kresta, Greg Todd (who teases me about my method of trash can research) Bill Garfield Jr., Mike Bauman, Dan Clendenin, Sam Eerdmans, Mike Hamilton, Herbert Cocking, Tom and Kathy Sigmon, Craig Mayes, Diane White, and Dan Lewis,

And to a number of scholars whom I am now getting to know, and am grateful for the path breaking work they have done in the field of evangelical historiography: Mark Noll, George Marsden, Martin Marty, Sam Hill, Randall Balmer, Harry Stout, Bill Ringenberg, Joel Carpenter, Nathan Hatch, Douglas Frank, William Vance Trollinger, Ronald L. Numbers,

Richard V. Pierard, John Stackhouse, and Daryl Hart. Thanks also to my brother Doug, who early on encouraged me to study and to think critically about Christianity, and to my mom and dad, for giving me an evangelical heritage and for believing in me. My dad, a self-taught Civil War historian, taught me to think historically from my earliest remembrances. Thanks as well to my mother-in-law Sandra Haney for the use of her laser printer. It was especially helpful in the early drafts of this dissertation.

The greatest debt I owe is to my wife Karen and children Kurt and Sandra who endured the long years of this endeavor. The number of times I was too immersed in study and writing to give them the time they deserve from me are too many to remember. I hope I can make it up to them in the end. Toward the end of this study my son Weston Carnell was born. He has brought much joy to our family. His middle name reflects my own affection and respect for Edward Carnell. My wife Karen and highest earthly love has been my greatest source of encouragement in this project. Her patience with my procrastination and periodic despair showed me the depth of her inner qualities that often put me to shame. To her I dedicate this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Attempting to define the terms fundamentalism and evangelicalism is as difficult a job as nailing jello to the wall. More difficult, perhaps, is the task of defining who qualifies as an evangelical or a fundamentalist. Evangelical historians are currently about the task of identifying the historical antecedents of what is commonly understood to be American evangelicalism. Out of this has come a great deal of debate between two specific schools of thought; the Wesleyan - Holiness and the Reformed - Presbyterian traditions. George Marsden, a representative of the Reformed - Presbyterian paradigm, identifies the term evangelical "as referring to the now classical tradition arising out of the eighteenth-century awakenings." The significance of this statement is in his identification of evangelicalism with "the eighteenth-century awakenings."[1] Eighteenth-century revivalism was a Reformed - Calvinistic experience. As a representative of the Wesleyan - Holiness paradigm, Donald Dayton has pointed out that evangelicalism

---

[1]George M. Marsden, "Fundamentalism and American Evangelicalism," in The Variety of American Evangelicalism, eds., Donald W. Dayton and Robert K, Johnston (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), p. 33.

is more closely related to nineteenth-century revivalism, particularly the social activism that arose from it. "The revivalistic movement incarnated an element of protest against nominal Christianity and the traditional churches that sometimes manifested itself in a rather sectarian dynamic."[2] Dayton brings to light that the membership roles of the National Association of Evangelicals and the historical roots of mainline evangelical colleges and seminaries reveals that a great deal of contemporary evangelicalism has a direct link to nineteenth-century revivalism.[3] In Dayton's analysis, if evangelicalism is to be understood from the standpoint of the Reformed paradigm, then the Wesleyan - Holiness paradigm (including Pentecostalism) must be understood as something other than evangelical.[4] The scope of this study, however, is not concerned with resolving the questions raised in the above debate, yet its importance cannot be overlooked with regards to defining the term evangelical. The terms evangelicalism and fundamentalism are both similar and incongruent. Within the conservative evangelical community the terms are sometimes understood as mutually exclusive. For instance, a conservative evangelical will agree with a fundamentalist on

---

[2]Donald W. Dayton, Discovering an Evangelical Heritage (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988), p. 139.

[3]Ibid., p. 139.

[4]Donald W. Dayton, "The Limits of Evangelicalism: The Pentecostal Tradition," in The Variety of American Evangelicalism, p. 51.

almost every line of doctrine,[5] yet draw the line when it comes to the issue of separatism.[6] To make matters even more confusing, there are those who take a fundamentalist position on separation but still refer to themselves as evangelicals. There are even those who deny most of the historic doctrines of evangelical Christianity who refer to themselves as evangelicals. Conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists have at least one thing in common insofar as they would identify the above-mentioned evangelical as "liberal." What I have just described is the tip of the iceberg as far as evangelical and fundamentalist identity is concerned. The limits of this particular study, however, do not allow us the space to pursue an exhaustive analysis of definitions, yet at least some understanding of these terms is in order.

The term evangelical has its origin in the New Testament Greek word "euangelion," which mean "gospel" or more literally "good news." Twentieth century evangelicals claim to embrace the gospel (good news) of Jesus Christ in

---

[5]These doctrines include the Virgin birth, the deity of Christ, Christ atonement for sins, the inspiration and authority of the Bible, the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and His second coming.

[6]I discuss separatism in chapter three of this study. Fundamentalists are notorious for separating not only from what they consider to be worldliness, but also from other Christians whom they feel are compromisers by not taking the same stand on separation.

the same manner which the first century Church embraced it.[7] Though this study deals with a particular group of evangelicals (new evangelicals) I will define an evangelical as one belonging to any protestant group or denomination whose roots stem from eighteenth and nineteenth century revivalism. Despite the obvious historical departure that the nineteenth-century revivalists made from the preceding system of Presbyterian Calvinism,[8] it is still safe to say that they were heirs to the Reformation tradition. An evangelical, therefore, is one who embraces the authority and inspiration of the Bible, and is committed to sharing the "good news" with the unconverted.

I have used the term fundamentalism to describe a movement within evangelical Christianity that reacted strongly against modernism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The earmarks of fundamentalism include a suspicion of modern learning, separation from the world and other Christians whom they consider compromisers with

---

[7]Ronald H. Nash, Evangelicals in America: Who They Are, What They Believe (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), pp. 22-23.

[8]The revivalists of the early to mid-nineteenth century despised the Calvinistic idea that God predestines some for hell and others (the elect) for heaven. That God would predestine people for hell and still say it's their fault was considered unacceptable. Nineteenth-century revivalists, on the other hand, believed that God gives people a free will choice to accept or reject His offer of salvation. These same revivalists also rejected the idea of a centralized ecclesiastical authority that Presbyterianism was structured around. See Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

the world, and a commitment to biblical orthodoxy.[9] The defining difference between fundamentalists and evangelicals, then, is over the issue of separation. Evangelicals generally do not separate themselves from the world or from their more liberal-minded fellow believers. Fundamentalists see the separation issue as core to their code of belief and conduct.

Fundamentalism began to emerge in the early 1900s as a reaction to the growth of modernism. The roots of fundamentalism stem back to the last two decades of the nineteenth century. During this period evangelicals felt threatened by Darwinism, atheism, and the higher criticism of the Bible by liberal scholars. It was not until 1910 that evangelical leaders published a twelve volume set of apologetic treatise entitled, The Fundamentals. Though the terms fundamentalist and fundamentalism were not yet being utilized by evangelicals, the ideological foundations for the fundamentalist movement were in place. A fundamentalist was one who was committed to upholding the fundamentals of the historic Christian faith.[10]

The term fundamentalist was first used by Curtis Lee Laws, editor of the Baptist Watchman-Examiner, in 1920. In the years to follow many evangelicals would wilfully abandon the term evangelical for fundamentalist since it expressed a

---

[9]Biblical orthodoxy was understood mainly as a commitment to biblical inerrancy.

[10]See footnote 5.

more committed, biblically sound position. Critics of fundamentalism have argued that the movement was a failure by the late 1920s due to a number of denominational schisms and the humiliating cultural defeat of the fundamentalists at the Scopes trial in 1925.[11] By the 1930s fundamentalism was on the rebound and emerging as a popular movement. Fundamentalists concentrated their efforts on building Bible schools, seminaries, radio broadcasting companies, and mission organizations.[12] Post-World War II fundamentalism remained concerned about the issues over which the preceding generation fought, yet the issue of separation had taken on a new dimension: separation from worldly, compromising believers. Fundamentalists of the 1920s and 1930s were also in favor of separating from apostate believers, but the issue was not at the forefront like it was for the post 1945 generation of fundamentalists. This study deals more specifically with the post-1945 generation since it was this group of fundamentalists that confronted the new evangelicals.

The new evangelical movement (some have referred to it as the neo evangelical movement) developed as a response to the negative image that fundamentalism had portrayed to the

---

[11]While the fundamentalists won the court case at the 1925 trial they lost their case before a watching world, and were ultimately the object of scorn.

[12]Joel A. Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945" (Ph.D dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1984).

world. The term new evangelicalism was coined by Harold John Ockenga in 1947. New evangelicalism, as distinct from evangelicalism, was to be a movement that would change the negative image of fundamentalism both socially and intellectually. In essence, it would be a reformed fundamentalism. Fundamentalism had gained a reputation for its anti-social and anti-intellectual attitudes. The new evangelicals, who emerged from the fundamentalist movement during the 1940s, were set on changing these negative images and restoring evangelical Christianity to a respectable position in the marketplace of truth. The first thing they did was attain impressive graduate degrees from major universities, especially from Harvard. Fundamentalists in the 1920s and 1930s rarely ever went to secular universities for accredited graduate degree.[13] The new evangelicals presumed that accredited academic credentials would not only prepare them for serious academic work, but also improve their chances of being accepted by the greater academic community. The second task was to produce scholarship that addressed the issues of the day. Some of these works addressed the need for an evangelical social agenda while others focused on issues of theology and local church polity. Carl Henry's path breaking work, The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), spoke directly to the lack of concern among

---

[13]Fundamentalists were notorious for giving each other honorary degrees. See chapter one.

fundamentalists for the social and political issues of the day. Some consider this book to be the key work to represent the new evangelical agenda.

It is the purpose of this study to look at the role that the new evangelical intellectuals played in the development of the new evangelicalism. New evangelical intellectuals like Carl Henry, Harold John Ockenga, and Edward John Carnell believed that they were going to restore the intellectual foundations of evangelical Christianity. They spoke openly about producing "world shaking" literature that the non-Christian academic community would not be able to ignore. To some extent, the new evangelicals were successful in producing scholarship of a higher quality than their fundamentalist predecessors, yet, as we shall see, they were never really successful at impressing the non-Christian academic community or moving beyond the issues that earlier fundamentalists debated. There are a number of variables that helped to work against the intellectual goals of the new evangelicals. The chapters in this study outline these variables in chronological order.

The first chapter lays a foundation for the eventual emergence of the new evangelical movement. I discuss the ways in which the fundamentalists of the 1920s and 1930s developed and expressed their suspicion of modern learning. Critics have often argued that fundamentalists are anti-intellectual and backward, yet I have shown that they were, instead, selectively intellectual insofar as they believed

that all learning must be submitted to a belief in the authority of the Bible. This position among fundamentalists kept them from entering the mainstream academic community. There were, nevertheless, many educated people within their camp. This was the intellectual atmosphere from which the new evangelicals emerged.

In chapter two I discuss the new evangelical repudiation of fundamentalism for its lack of concern for a serious social agenda and more specifically for its lack of intellectual credibility. I show the ways that a number of new evangelical intellectuals expressed their contempt for fundamentalism with specific reference to Edward John Carnell's repudiation of fundamentalism. I argue that Carnell understood the necessity of letting go of the negative image of fundamentalism in order to make the new evangelicalism a success. Carnell received serious rebukes, not only from fundamentalists, but from his new evangelical colleagues. Instead of a unified new evangelical goal there developed a problem of conflicting ideals among the new evangelicals. Some new evangelicals refused to let go of the mentality of fundamentalism while others (like Carnell) were quick to condemn it. Chapter three explores the fundamentalist response to the criticisms of the new evangelicals. The war of words that developed between the new evangelicals and the fundamentalists was reminiscent of the war of words between the earlier fundamentalists and modernists. The infighting between these two groups helped

to sidetrack the new evangelicals from their initial goal to reform the intellectual image of evangelicalism.

The intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals is discussed in chapter four. The new evangelicals would experience some success in terms of publishing more competent scholarly works, yet they were never able to seriously move beyond issues of theology and apologetics. The plan for a major evangelical research university was never realized nor did they publish major works in the areas of science and philosophy. Much of this was due to the new evangelicals being sidetracked by their war with separatist fundamentalists and their ongoing attempts to reconcile the fundamentalist-modernist debates of the preceding generation.

Finally in chapter five I look at the intellectual vision of Edward John Carnell as the necessary paradigm for the new evangelical intellectual agenda. Carnell possessed the mind of a true scholar, yet he was tormented by the realization that his evangelical identity would be more of a hindrance than an asset. He understood the implications of fundamentalism and how it would ultimately stifle evangelicals socially and intellectually. He was a lonely man who admitted that he was of a different intellectual perspective than many of his peers.

In researching the new evangelical movement I discovered that there are a number of works that addressed uncritically the academic activities of the new

evangelicals. One of the first works to make mention of the intellectual activities of the new evangelicalism was Louis Gasper's book, The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956 (1963). He argues that since World War II the new evangelicals had been reversing the negative trend of fundamentalism by publishing "a body of erudite literature."[14] He further says that the new evangelicals "made impressive gains" in the 1950s in the area of theology.[15] Gasper's analysis is thorough, yet fails to point out that the new evangelical intellectual agenda was primarily an in-house exercise and was not widely recognized outside the evangelical community.

Mark Noll's outstanding work, Between Faith and Criticism (1986), addresses the new evangelical intellectual agenda from the standpoint of biblical and theological scholarship. The scope of his book does not intend to go beyond the constraints of theological scholarship. He points out that in the early stages of the new evangelical movement few evangelical scholars "seemed eager to engage the general intellectual values of the modern university or the specific conventions of critical Bible scholarship." He goes on to say that "only a few in this generation of evangelical scholars published for the academic world at

---

[14]Louis Gasper. The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1963]), pp. 115-117.

[15]Ibid., p.116.

large."[16] Noll does not, however, successfully show the ways in which new evangelical scholars had impacted the greater academic community.

More recent critiques of the new evangelicalism have made mention of its unnecessary "fixation with theology," and definition of evangelicalism in exclusively theological categories.[17] The new evangelical (and presently evangelical) fixation with theology stems in large part from the unresolved conflicts of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920s and 1930s. The new evangelicalism was a movement born of controversy and continued to be controversial through the 1960s. Having failed to resolve the theological controversies of its fundamentalists predecessors it appeared to take on many of the divisive characteristics of fundamentalism. For example, by the 1970s the inerrancy debate[18] would reemerge to capture the attention of evangelicals and eventually lead to fragmentation and division within their own ranks. Not only was this a continuation of the age old fundamentalist-modernist debate over inspiration, but now it was between

---

[16]Mark A. Noll. Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), pp. 97-99.

[17]Stanley J. Grenz. Revisioning Evangelical Theology: A Fresh Agenda for the 21st Century. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), p. 30.

[18]The term inerrancy is used by evangelicals to refer to the total trustworthiness and inspiration of the Bible. Some evangelicals refer only to inerrancy in the "original" autographs of the Bible.

evangelicals and evangelicals. In this sense, evangelicals had retained some of the mentality of fundamentalism.

This study in no way attempts to write off completely the intellectual activities of the new evangelicals. I have acknowledged that the new evangelicals made significant strides forward in their attempt to reform fundamentalism. Just how successful they were in achieving their goal is a question that this study will attempt to answer.

I have focused on the years 1942-1970 mainly because the reference to the "new" evangelicalism had fallen from the vocabulary of most evangelicals by 1970. The new evangelicalism became, as Richard Quebedeaux writes, "Establishment Evangelicalism."[19] The vision for the new evangelicalism that was shared by Carl Henry, Billy Graham, and Harold Ockenga would not be shared by many in their children's generation.[20] The specific agenda of the post-World War II generation would ultimately be difficult to maintain in the next generation of baby boomers who would define the term evangelicalism more liberally than their fathers would like. As to the intellectual gains in the present evangelical scholarly community, only time will

---

[19]Richard Quebedeaux. The Young Evangelicals. (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 37.

[20]Augustus Cerillo, Jr., and Murray W. Dempster. Salt and Light: Evangelical Political Thought in Modern America. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989); and Robert Booth Fowler. A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

tell. They still have no major research university,[21] and their acceptance in the larger academic community, though better than it was twenty years ago, leaves much to be desired. In the area of philosophy there has been some gain through the influences of scholars like Alvin Plantinga of Notre Dame University and Nicholas P. Wolterstorff of Yale. In History there has been significant academic work produced by scholars such as Mark Noll of Wheaton College, George Marsden of Notre Dame, Nathan Hatch of Notre Dame, Harry Stout of Yale, Randy Balmer of Columbia University, Grant Wacker of the University of North Carolina, Bradley Longfield of Duke University, and Ronald Numbers of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Evangelicals may never feel at home in the wider academic community, not because they are intellectually inferior, but rather because of their historic Christian convictions that place them at odds with a world system alien from their own.

---

[21]Evangelicals have produced a number of quality institutions of higher learning over the years. These include Wheaton College and Graduate School, Calvin College, Liberty University, Westmont College, Houghton College, North Park College, Anderson University, and Gordon College. Though there are a number of denominational universities within the evangelical educational circle, there is still no major research university that cuts across the denominational divide. A cross-denominational research univerity was the desired institution of the new evangelicals. See Chapter four.

Chapter One

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE AND THE SUSPICION OF MODERN LEARNING

> Higher education, finding root in unsaved hearts produces inevitably, shameless unbelief, often dragging in its ignoble train, licentious living, heartache, broken homes, shattered hopes and all manner of ungodliness. It makes men, "heady, high minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." (II Timothy 3:4)[1]

The late nineteenth century proved to be a time of intense struggle for American evangelicals. Up until this time evangelicals prided themselves on being God's elect people to bring His truth to the world, many of whom believed literally that America was analogous to the nation of Israel.[2]

The situation that evangelicals found themselves in post-civil war America was nothing short of an historical earthquake as the nation was rapidly becoming a first-rate industrial and political power. Along side these sweeping changes was a growing sense of discontent and frustration among those who would eventually call for political and social reform by the century's end. The nation soon found

---

[1]Joseph Stowell, "Death on the Campus," The Baptist Bulletin 5 (July 1939): 1-4,

[2]On millennial themes in American history, see Ruth H. Bloch, Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Perry Miller, Errand into the Wilderness (Cambridge:Harvard University Press, 1956); and Ernest Lee Tuveson, Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

itself searching for a workable social order from which to construct a practical and secure way of life, but to some extent found itself even more discontented and less confident.[3] From within this context the fundamentalist movement was emerging with its own concerns and agendas, primarily for its own survival and less so for any kind of social reform.[4] To be sure, fundamentalists repudiated their more social minded evangelical kin-folk, fearing that they had abandoned orthodox Christianity in favor of a watered down modernistic theology.[5] Modernism was a general term that fundamentalists used to describe the liberalization process in American society, especially in the realms of science and biblical studies. Their primary concerns were Darwinism and the higher criticism, particularly as they came to bear on the local church. By the 1870s Darwinism and higher criticism had replaced the preexisting paradigms of Baconian inductivism and orthodox biblical literalism that evangelicals generally used to

---

[3]Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967); and Henry F. May, The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Own Time, 1912-1917 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), pp. 121-329.

[4]Norris Magnuson, Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), p. xv.

[5]Donald K. Gorrell, The Age of Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era, 1900-1920 (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), pp. 129-130, 229-230; and Richard F. Lovelace, Dynamics of Spiritual Life: An Evangelical Theology of Renewal (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1979), p. 50.

defend the faith, yet, not in the minds of most fundamentalists. Regardless of the historical realities, popular fundamentalist preachers and Bible teachers continued to utilize these methods long abandoned by most scholars and teachers in their study and defense of the Bible. The unwillingness of fundamentalists to let go of their established ways of doing theology and understanding the world around them was indicative of the direction that the fundamentalist movement was moving in the early decades of the twentieth century. Most fundamentalists believed that they could hold their ground against the modernists while many others resigned themselves to the reality that they no longer held a position of predominance in American society. Douglas Frank has argued that evangelicals, stemming back to the nineteenth century, were at best a "shrinking and defensive minority," bemoaning the fact that they were no longer, "running the show."[6]

The intellectual climate in which the fundamentalist movement was evolving reflected a new found commitment to higher education, rigorous academic inquiry, academic professionalization, and academic freedom.[7] This new

---

[6]Douglas Frank, Less Than Conquerors: How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 3; and Milton L. Rudnick, Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod: A Historical Study of Their Interaction and Mutual Influence (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966), p. 37.

[7]Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), pp. 383-412; and Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American

climate paralleled the positive atmosphere of the Progressive Era in the early twentieth century. The life of the mind during the Progressive Era was growing stronger and more confident. Intellectual horizons widened, intellectuals felt more "free and exuberant," and in touch, "with the national mood."[8] "Pre-1910 American intellectuals," says Roderick Nash, "believed it their responsibility to lead the nation upward and onward." These intellectuals were still riding the wave of confidence in the results of the enlightenment. Man was perceived as finally arriving, his intellect fully capable of understanding and utilizing the fruits of scientific analysis.[9]

Fundamentalists during the progressive era felt as though they were surrounded by enemies on all sides including, "diabolically clever professors, proud scientists, and dissolute society people." They felt even worse about the fact that their own churches were filled with liberal compromisers and infidels.[10] These external pressures caused fundamentalists to develop what R. Laurence Moore calls an outsider mindset which resulted in part from

---

University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), Chapters 5-7.

[8]Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), pp. 204-205.

[9]Roderick Nash, The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930 (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970), p. 34.

[10]May, The End of American Innocence, p. 128.

a defensive reaction to intellectual insecurity.[11] By the time of the First World War, American fundamentalists began to take on a more visible outsider role. They became, in essence, America's other lost generation.[12] The outsider status of fundamentalists in America corresponded to their official position on separation from the world. The motto of the separatist fundamentalists taken from the Bible was "Come out from among them and be ye separate." Being outsiders in American culture was a position that fundamentalists readily accepted, especially in the realm of modern learning. While some early fundamentalists made every effort to establish credibility in the greater academic community,[13] others placed greater confidence in the fundamentalist rank and file, thus scorning those with

---

[11]R. Laurence Moore, Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 165.

[12]Ibid., p. 163; For an interesting analysis of America's lost generation of intellectuals and other social discontents see Nash, The Nervous Generation, chapter 3.

[13]B.B. Warfield and Charles Hodge were examples of conservative evangelicals who in no way supported an anti-intellectual agenda, but instead attempted to give full support to scientific and rational inquiry. See Mark Stephen Massa, S.J., Charles Augustus Briggs and the Crisis of Historical Criticism (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 60. It is important to note that Augustus Strong was himself supportive of many of the conclusions of modern science and scholarship. Strong did not align himself with the liberals or the fundamentalists throughout his academic career. Toward the end of his life, however, he sided with the fundamentalists. See Grant Wacker, Augustus H. Strong and the Dilemma of Historical Consciousness (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985).

advanced learning and scholarly calling.[14] The bulk of this suspicion of modern learning stemmed, in part, from the fundamentalist humiliation over the liberalization of their own denominational colleges and seminaries. As fundamentalists lost their denominational power hold on local churches to liberal protestants, they claimed also that their control of the educational institutions had been subverted by the same.[15] During the 1890s, conservative evangelicals attempted to fight back against the liberal influence in the mainline seminaries by staging a number of heresy trials against professors who had been accused of teaching unorthodox theology. Three of the most significant cases were those of Charles Briggs, Henry Preserved Smith, and A. C. McGiffert, each of whom was tried for heresy by the Presbyterian Church and eventually disfellowshiped. The main issue involved was their less than orthodox views on inerrancy and their acceptance of higher criticism.[16] Inerrancy is the belief that the Bible is without error in

---

[14]Ferenc Morton Szasz, The Divided Mind of Protestant America, 1880-1930 (University: University of Alabama Press, 1982), p. 96.

[15]Virginia Lieson Brereton, Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880-1940 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), p. 33

[16]George M. Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century American Evangelicalism, 1870-1925 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 117; Mark A. Noll, Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), pp. 28-29; and Ernest R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 251.

everything that it affirms. Generally, evangelicals accept the notion that the Bible is inerrant in the original manuscripts of the Bible. The question of inerrancy would eventually become the litmus test for "true" orthodoxy among fundamentalists.

In its beginning stage, fundamentalism reflected some academic promise. This promise was most evident in the production of a twelve volume set of polemical treatise known as The Fundamentals, published between 1910 and 1915. Funded by the wealthy oil magnate, Lyman Stewart, the twelve volume project aimed to stem the tide of an insidious modernism as well as to encourage believers to more prayer, more evangelism, and more personal experience with God. The list of contributors to The Fundamentals read like a "Who's Who" in conservative evangelicalism. A total of sixty-four authors were chosen for the project. Most of the contributors were not highly trained scholars, at least according to the academic standards of their day, yet among this group were a few scholars with professional credentials such as James Orr of the United Free Church College of Scotland,[17] George L. Robinson of McCormick Seminary, and Oberlin College professor George Frederick Wright. For all the claims that The Fundamentals would represent a scholarly treatment of orthodox Christianity and rational critique of modernism, the editors seemed to have a more practical

---

[17]Orr received his greatest acclaim from publishing four articles in The Fundamentals, see Glen G. Scorgie, A Call for Continuity: The Theological Contribution of James Orr (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), pp. 150-151.

concern with getting these works into the hands of "every pastor, evangelist, missionary, theological student, sunday school superintendent, Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. secretary in the English speaking world, so far as the address of all these can be obtained."[18] In terms of its scholarly appeal, little more than a half-dozen professional journals bothered to review The Fundamentals.[19] This project represented, perhaps, the best conservative evangelical scholarship of the day, yet, as Sandeen has shown, its publication produced "scarcely a ripple in the scholarly world and had little impact upon biblical studies and theology."[20] Due to its overall appeal to the religious rank and file, there is little wonder that the greater academic community failed to give The Fundamentals more than a passing glance. A survey of the contents of most of the articles will reveal that the focus was more devotional in tone than it was scholarly.[21] In addition to the concerns over the virgin birth, Christ's deity, the atonement, the resurrection, and biblical authority, The Fundamentals were a "disavowal of the scholarship and method in schools of religion, and of the

---

[18]The Fundamentals volume I (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1910), forward to volume I.

[19]William R. Hutchison, The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 198.

[20]Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 199.

[21]Ibid., p. 206.

arts and sciences in free colleges."[22]

As we have shown, the appearance of some learned scholars among the list of contributors to The Fundamentals failed to arouse interest in the academic community at large. Even in its appeal to the rank and file the responses were at best lethargic and critically detached. In fact, most of the letters the editors received in response to The Fundamentals were quaint notes of thanks and requests for address changes.[23] There is no easy answer to the question of why The Fundamentals seemed to receive such an ambivalent response on both sides. The articles targeted most of the issues important to conservative evangelicalism. One third of the articles were dedicated to a defense of the scriptures, including critiques of higher criticism. Another third were dedicated to apologetics, the nature of the trinity, the doctrine of sin, and the doctrine of salvation. The remaining third were articles more difficult to classify.[24]

Included in this category was an article by a prominent lawyer named Philip Mauro entitled "Modern Philosophy." The content of the article reflected the strong anti-modernistic sentiment of the conservative evangelical community, but

---

[22]Stewart G. Cole, The History of Fundamentalism (Hamden: Archon Books, 1963 [1931]), pp. 60-61.

[23]Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 206.

[24]Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 119-120; For a chart that analyzes the contents of The Fundamentals see, Rudnick, Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod, pp. 40-41.

more so it reflected a stern warning to Christians about the pitfalls of modern philosophy. Mauro begins by quoting the standard anti-philosophy text, Colossians 2:8-10. "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after [according to] the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." "Philosophers," according to Mauro, "have managed to maintain in Christendom the same eminence which they occupied in heathendom." Regretfully, philosophy has somehow managed to become an important part of theological education and holds a higher position of authority than the Bible itself would give it.[25] Verbal attacks on modernism and philosophy are more obvious indications of the fundamentalist distrust of reason, yet their failure to interact not only with the critical theories of the day but with critical thinkers as well, is perhaps an even more obvious sign. In the case of Philip Mauro we see virtually no mention of, or interaction with the critical philosophers of the day. There is a brief mention of William James, but this amounts to little more than a condensed overview of a series of lectures he delivered in 1909 entitled, "The Present Situation in Philosophy."[26]

When all was said and done, approximately three million copies of The Fundamentals had been circulated. The wide

---

[25]Philip Mauro, "Modern Philosophy," in The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth, volume II (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, 1910-1915), p. 85.

[26]Ibid., pp. 93-95.

circulation of The Fundamentals is in a way an indication that it was the "manifesto of the whole tradition,"[27] for there were many other conservative evangelicals who paid little attention to the issues of concern surrounding the publication of The Fundamentals.[28] For all that it attempted to do, The Fundamentals were never really successful in maintaining the intellectual credibility of evangelical Christianity. Despite overwhelming odds, conservative evangelicals fought on with out-dated weapons of intellectual warfare, but the focus of their attention now turned toward the popular religious constituency. The Fundamentals, therefore, were but a foretaste of the popular direction that evangelicalism was going and the level at which it would function for years to follow.

The years following World War I would find fundamentalists on the losing end of most of their battles. They lost control of many churches in the major denominations like the Presbyterians and the Northern Baptists, they failed to keep modernism away from the foreign mission field,[29] and now they had failed to gain

---

[27]David N. Livingstone, Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter Between Evangelical Theology and Evolutionary Thought (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 148.

[28]Most notable, perhaps, were the Missouri Synod Lutherans and the Southern Baptists.

[29]James Alan Patterson, "The Loss of a Protestant Missionary Consensus: Foreign Missions and the Fundamentalist-Modernist Conflict," in Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980, Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk, eds., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), pp. 73-91

control of the denominational seminaries and colleges and were faced with having to find a way to win back control. Time would tell, however, whether it would be possible for the fundamentalists to attain this goal. Certainly within denominational circles, following World War I, fundamentalists were embroiled in an intense fight to win back control, especially among the Northern Baptists, Disciples of Christ, and the Northern Presbyterians.[30] But the attempt to win back their colleges and seminaries had lost most of its fervor by the 1920s. Turning from failed attempts to win back control of the educational institutions, fundamentalists began to focus their efforts on building Bible institutes for the purpose of training believers in the art of evangelism and lay ministry.[31] The Bible School Movement got its start in the late nineteenth century beginning with the Missionary Training Institute (1882) and Moody Bible Institute (1886). Soul-winning became, perhaps, the most important activity in the agenda of the Bible school movement as fundamentalists were convinced that Christ's second coming was at hand. Some were so convinced that they campaigned to win an entire

---

[30]For an extensive analysis of the denominational controversies of the 1920s, see Cole, The History of Fundamentalism, pp. 65-225; Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (Hamden: Archon Books, 1963), pp. 103-181; Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, pp. 171-175; and Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, pp 233-269.

[31]Brereton, Training God's Army, pp. 55-77.

generation for Christ before His return.[32] In the early twentieth century Bible Schools developed in response to the revivalistic spirit as well as the growing secularization of American education.[33] As fundamentalists grew more convinced that secular education was controlled by the modernists, the more entrenched they became in the idea that "true" education should be centered around the complete authority of the Bible. Fundamentalists began to repudiate the non-biblical insights of the scholarly community, placing greater credibility in the biblically informed evangelical rank and file. Fundamentalist leaders led the way in this endeavor through the medium of popular literature and easily accessible Bible schools and Bible conferences. One such popular leader was the evangelist R.A. Torrey who gave up the pursuit of academic study for a lifetime service of evangelism and Bible teaching, clearly stating his contempt for modern scholarship in his book, The Importance and Value of Proper Bible Study (1921). Torrey sarcastically referred to those with learned degrees as, "D.D., Ph.D., L.L.D., Litt.D., F.R.G.S., A.S.S." If God says something is so, then it would be in one's best

---

[32]Although Mott started his ministry before the fundamentalist movement began, his theology was identifiable with fundamentalism. The "Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions" was focused on evangelizing as many as possible before Christ's second advent. See John R. Mott The Evangelization of the World in this Generation (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1902).

[33]William C. Ringenberg, The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 157.

interest to believe what He says, "in spite of all the A.S.S.E.S. in the world."[34] Along the same line it was common to hear fundamentalists ridicule Ph.Ds as direct descendants from monkeys and baboons, which, according to Marsden, "was always good for a laugh from an anti-evolution crowd."[35] The superiority of the biblically trained, spiritually sensitive layman was a common theme in Torrey's writing.

> I have known uncultured people, almost illiterate people, washerwomen and such like, for example, who had studied and, therefore, did know the Bible, and,therefore, they knew more of the wisdom that really counts, the wisdom that spells salvation, in five minutes, than these learned professors knew in their whole lifetime.[36]

The guidance of the Holy Spirit, in Torrey's opinion, was an added help for the uneducated layman to interpret the scriptures. "The greatest university professor, or theological professor," cannot properly interpret the scriptures because he is not in a right relationship to God.[37] Its not entirely clear why Torrey developed such an

---

[34]R.A. Torrey, The Importance and Value of Proper Bible Study (Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1921), p. 45.

[35]Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 212.

[36]Torrey, The Importance, p. 19.

[37]Ibid., p. 88; Torrey tells of a French scientist who, while on a trip in Arabia, tells his guide that he is ignorant for praying to a God that he cannot see, touch, or experience. The next day the scientist told him that there was a camel walking around outside the tent while they slept. "How do you know?," said the guide. The scientist answered that there were camel footprints around the tent. "Did you hear the camel?" "No," said the scientist. " Did you put out your hand and touch the camel?" To which the

animosity toward the secular academic community, especially in light of the fact that he had extensive education, including a year of theological study in Germany at Leipzig and Erlangen.[38] The open animosity that many fundamentalists displayed toward modern learning did not necessarily stem from an anti-intellectual perspective, but often from the criticism that it abandoned the authoritative Word of God. In the years preceding the official founding of the fundamentalist movement (1920), notable evangelical scholars had a biblically informed confidence that science, rather than being an enemy of the faith, was an ally.[39] The popular religious leader, William Jennings Bryan even expressed his admiration for science and biblical authority, making sure to communicate that he was not anti-scientific or anti-intellectual. There was no conflict between the heart and the head, according to Bryan, but if called on to

---

scientist answered again, "No." The guide made his point by saying, "You are a strange man of science to believe in a camel you never saw, a camel you never heard, a camel you never put out your hands and touched." The scientist retorted by saying, "here are his footprints all around the tent."The guide said pointing to the sun, "Behold the footprints of the creator, and know that there is a God." Torrey makes the point that the untutored savage won the argument. See, R.A. Torrey, Anecdotes and Illustrations (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1907), pp. 108-109; and Robert E. Wenger, "Social Thought in American Fundamentalism" (Ph.D dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1973), p. 79.

[38]Paul C. Witt, "Reuban Archer Torrey" in the Dictionary of Christianity in America, ed., Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1990), pp. 1180-1181.

[39]George M. Marsden, "Evangelicals and the Scientific Culture: An Overview," in Religion and Twentieth- Century American Intellectual Life ed., Michael J. Lacey (Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 25.

make a decision between having a strong intellect or receptive heart, he would choose the heart.[40] In a letter to a high school student, Bryan attempted to make a similar point regarding the over emphasis on the intellect. The temptation to forget God is one result of trusting the head over the heart, as was in the case of Adam and Eve. The other temptation is to put selfish interests above the interests of the common good. Bryan reminded the young student that the mind must not think itself too highly, for faith is greater than reason.[41]

These kinds of sympathies, though often perceived as mere anti-intellectualism, were, as we have seen, more informed by an overwhelming conviction that the Bible itself was the only proper basis for education on any level. In his work, The Bible: The True University, S. Ridout attempts to lay out the biblical foundation for every academic discipline imaginable, including astronomy, geology, physical geography, chemistry, physics, mineralogy, botany, zoology, anthropology, psychology, ethics, medical science, surgery, hygienics, domestic science, the care of children, elementary education, language and mathematics, ethnology,

---

[40]Lawrence W. Levine, Defender of the Faith William Jennings Bryan: The Last Decade, 1915-1925 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 279; William Jennings Bryan, The Fundamentals in a series entitled, "Can Fundamentalists Win?" The Forum LXX (July 1923): 1665-1680; Morton White, Pragmatism and the American Mind: Essays and Reviews in Philosophy and Intellectual History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 79.

[41]Letter from William Jennings Bryan to Mr. Earl Cranston, January 22, 1913 (Woodland Historical Document Collections, Irving, Texas)

archeology, history, political science, literature, biography, poetry, and the arts.[42] Ridout's concern was that young men were being led "further and further from God" in American colleges and universities. In his analysis, the biblical foundation for "all" learning should be laid before the young go off to study in the pagan institutions of higher learning.[43] Despite the severe criticism that secular education received at the hands of fundamentalists, there was an understood confidence within this conservative subculture that the conclusions of modern scholarship could not change the fact that God's revelation was verbally inspired and inerrant.[44]

The renowned fundamentalist preacher T.T. Shields was adamant about his commitment to the authority of Christ's word over and above the scholarship of the world.

> I am convinced that the body of thought which is Worthiest the high and honorable title of scholarship and which represents the finding of disciplined intellectual powers in cooperation with spiritually enlightened and penetrating understandings, will always be found to be in agreement with the word of Him who is incarnate truth.[45]

Shields gained significant fame in the fundamentalist movement, exercising his influence mainly in Canada. His

---

[42]S. Ridout, The Bible: the True University (New York: Loizeau Brothers, 1912), pp. 18-41.

[43]Ibid., p. 29.

[44]Erling Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), p. 19.

[45]T.T. Shields, The Plot That Failed (Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1937), p. 177.

fame as a fundamentalist leader came to fruition when he became an outspoken critic of modernism at McMaster University in Ontario. He became more involved with American fundamentalism in the 1920s as he helped to establish the Baptist Bible Union, serving as its president for over seven years.[46] The popular evangelist D. L. Moody was concerned that ministers were educated over the heads of the uneducated classes. He was not of the opinion that their education was too much education, but rather that it is irrelevant to the lives and needs of the average person. A young man goes off to seminary and comes out "knowing nothing about human nature, doesn't know how to rub up to these men and adopt himself to them, and then gets up a sermon on metaphysical subjects miles above these people. We don't get down to them all; they move in another world. What we want is men trained for this class of people."[47] Such comments have solicited criticisms that Moody was an anti-intellectualist, yet, as Findlay has shown, he was an open-minded man at odds with his evangelical peers for not committing himself to many of their theological dogmas.[48] A contemporary of Moody, A. T. Pierson, came down on the side of the uneducated layman as he believed that "Scholastic

---

[46]Ed Dobson, et al., ed., The Fundamentalist Phenomenon: The Resurgence of Conservative Christianity (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), pp. 68-69

[47]Gene A. Getz, MBI: The Story of Moody Bible Institute (Chicago: Moody Press, 1969), p. 37

[48]James F. Findlay, Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist, 1837-1899 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973), p. 410

training is not necessary for effective service." In his experience there were numerous examples of "heroic men doing valiant battle for the lord and the faith, who were never in college or seminary."[49] Pierson, unlike Moody, was no stranger to scholarly inquiry. In his polemical work, Many Infallible Proofs, he states that Christians must not be satisfied to believe blindly the truths of the faith "for blind belief makes bigots" who embrace their belief system whether it is right or wrong. The same people have little tolerance for those with different beliefs. In keeping with the idea of the full power and authority of the Bible in matters of scholarship, Pierson argues that "God has made it possible for even the most unlearned to know the Bible is His Word." He comes to understand through his biblically informed personal experience rather than through rational argument.[50]

The notorious fundamentalist, and founder of the "World's Christian Fundamentals Association" (1920), William Bell Riley fought hard for the cause of popular fundamentalism. Himself an educated man, Riley had little respect or tolerance for the modernists who had captured the halls of higher learning. His concern was that modernism was seeping into the foundations of the Church itself,

---

[49]Arthur T. Pierson, The Crisis of Missions, or the Voice Out of the Cloud (London: James Nisbet & company, 1886), pp. 336-338.

[50]Arthur T. Pierson, Many Infallible Proofs: The Evidences of Christianity (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1886), pp. 14-17.

corrupting particularly the young people.[51] Education itself was not the issue for Riley, only an anti-Christian education.[52] Riley was known for his quick wit and articulate polemical rhetoric against those who accused him (and other fundamentalists) of anti-intellectual buffoonery. He was quick to point out the fallacy of the modernist-progressives who argued that the Church does not contain learned members from the scientific community or the academic world. The exact opposite was the case in Riley's opinion.[53] He was eager to show that there were many conservative evangelical scholars who could translate Greek and Hebrew with the best of them. The only difference is that the conservative scholars embrace the full authority of the Bible, whereas the modernists scoff in disbelief. These same scholars, having embraced the conservative cause and having repudiated higher criticism, are not considered as equals by the moderns.[54] Riley managed to balance out his

---

[51]William Bell Riley, The Menace of Modernism (New York: Christian and Missionary Alliance Publishing Company, 1917), p. 8 (Reprinted by Garland Publishing, 1988); The same concern was also expressed through allegorical novels, see W.S. Harris, Mr. World and Miss Church-Member: A Twentieth Century Allegory (G. Holzapfel, 1902).

[52]Ibid., p. 127

[53]Ibid., pp. 44-45; and Arthur I. Brown, "A Changing Science Versus a Changeless Faith," Serving and Waiting 22 (August-September 1932): 88-90. W. B. Riley, My Bible: An Apologetic (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1937), pp. 99-123.

[54]Riley, p. 57; For an interesting analysis of the question regarding the compatibility of belief in the Bible and true scholarship, see Charles G. Trumbull, Prophecy's Light on Today (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1937), pp. 164-165.

defense of the conservative evangelical scholar with practical caveats for those who would be influencing the Church from the pulpit. "I am not asking that the preacher of the twentieth century be as unschooled as was his predecessor in the nineteenth; I am only declaring it is a profound pity that having become more schooled, he has become less scriptural."[55] It seems so ironic that in an age of academic growth and professionalization, fundamentalists were content to place greater confidence in opinions of the rank and file. Their belief in the ultimate authority of the Bible justified this kind of response. One of the most puzzling aspects of the fundamentalists, in relation to their suspicion of modern learning, was the proclivity toward the giving of honorary degrees. It is unclear why it was important for fundamentalists to possess the title "Dr" especially when we take into consideration the way that Ph.Ds were ridiculed. While most fundamentalist leaders had earned undergraduate degrees, as well as seminary training, fewer had the professional credentials necessary for credible involvement in the academic community. Some fundamentalists intimated that not having a doctorate was "Almost like being without the proper clothes."[56] It has been recorded that at Wheaton College

---

[55]Riley, p. 146.

[56]Michael S. Hamilton, "Wheaton College and the Fundamentalist Network of Voluntary Associations, 1919-1965." A paper presented at the "Evangelicals, Voluntary Associations, and American Public Life," Conference. The Billy Graham Center, Wheaton, Illinois (June 13-15, 1991): 1-32.

alone over "one hundred seventy-five men and five women," were awarded honorary doctorates between 1920 and 1965. Most of these degrees were awarded to prominent Bible teachers, evangelists, pastors, and missionaries, who, in the words of J. Oliver Buswell, were "in a position to make friends for the college." Some of the most influential leaders in American fundamentalism received honorary degrees from Wheaton, including "Paul Rader, Arno Gaebelein, Frank Gaebelein, Don Shelton, Lewis Sperry Chafer, Charles G. Trumbull, J. Gresham Machen, Rowland Bingham, Paul Rood, Will H. Houghton, Robert McQuilkin, Harry Rimmer, Harry Strachan, Stephen Paine, E. Schuyler English, Torry Johnson, Philip Howard,Jr., Lewi Pethrus, A. W. Tozer, and Billy Graham." The giving away of these honorary degrees also fulfilled the purpose of showing publically the bond that existed between the honor granting institution and the honoree, or the institution he represented. By the 1930s approximately one third of all honorary doctorates in America were conferred on clergyman.[57] Perhaps fundamentalist leaders believed that their popular constituencies, like any other American populist group, were

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 12-13; The following important work was pointed out to me by Mike Hamilton; see Stephen E. Epler, Honorary Degrees: A Survey of Their Use and Abuse (Washington D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1943); For an excellent historical overview of how the status of the minister has gone from scholar to non-scholar, see Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., "Ministry and Scholarship in the Reformed Tradition," in Scholarship, Sacraments and Service: Historical Studies in Protestant Tradition: Essays in Honor of Bard Thompson. Daniel B. Clendenin and W. David Buschart, Editors, (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), PP. 1-28.

easily impressed by credentials while at the same time blessing their efforts against modern higher learning. If this was the case, it appears that much of the fundamentalist agenda was structured around the nurturing of a particular image. By the 1920s the fundamentalist movement was well under way and, for the most part, appeared to be in the hands of a popular religious constituency. While some fundamentalist leaders were attempting to defend the faith against modernism, the uneducated majority in the local churches were satisfied to remain ignorant about the issues.[58] The choice to remain ignorant, however, cannot be blamed entirely on the religious rank and file since it appears that the fundamentalist hierarchy failed to encourage them to develop a desire for critical thinking. While many fundamentalists chose to remain ignorant about science and education, it can be argued that some attempts were made at informing the Christian layperson of the critical issues of the day. This is particularly evident in the kinds of informative articles that fundamentalists published in periodicals such as the Sunday School Times, Moody Monthly, The Christian Fundamentalist, and Signs of the Times to name just a few. It should also be kept in mind that fundamentalist leaders, perhaps, did not see

---

[58]John Herman Randall, Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind: A Survey of the Intellectual Background of the Present Age (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940), p. 542; Rimmer recounts a story about a woman who wrote him off for not accepting as inspired the added dates in the margins of the English Bible. See Harry Rimmer, A Consideration of the Credibility of the Chronology of the Bible (Los Angeles: Research Science Bureau, 1929), pp. 3-4.

themselves as keeping the flock from critical thinking since, in their minds, by giving them the fully authoritative Word of God, they were giving them everything they needed for critical thinking of the highest variety. A survey of popular religious periodicals in the 1920s and 1930s reveals a great deal of concern for the issues of education and scientific investigation. Fundamentalists were quick to point out the essence of "true" education as informed by the authoritative Word of God. Charles Trumbull, editor of The Sunday School Times, claimed that all the scholars who wrote for the Times were fundamental, "Bible-loving scholars." These scholars did not give what Trumbull called "educated guesses," but rather messages of truth derived from the Bible.[59]

Articles in The Sunday School Times, as in many other religious weeklies, focused on the theme of biblical authority in every area of the believer's life. "Intellectual orthodoxy without a heart-life witnessing to the cleansing and keeping power of the Lord," was, according to one author, a perilous and dangerous thing indeed.[60] The concern that Christian students were in danger of losing their faith on secular college campuses was ever present in the minds of fundamentalists, yet, as a sign of encouragement and reinforcement of the validity of the

---

[59]Charles G. Trumbull, Science and the Christian (New York, 1924), p. 73

[60]"Fundamentalism's Light in This Dark World," The Sunday School Times 74 (July 9, 1932): 361-362

faith, testimonial articles were published by students who had managed to hold on to the faith in the face of a modernistic education.[61] Other victorious testimonies could likewise be found pertaining to soul-winning campaigns on university campuses[62] and special campus out-reach ministries to those whose faith was coming under fire from the enemy.[63]

"The League of Evangelical Students" was yet another positive force on the campuses of major universities during this time. The league argued that genuine scholarship is necessary for Bible study. Christians do not have to dispense with science and learning. Christians ought to be able to give a defense of the faith when called on to do so. Acceptance of the truth of the Bible is completely reasonable. Bible believers should never be afraid of modern scholarship. Obscurantism and anti-intellectualism were repudiated by "The League of Evangelical Students."[64]

---

[61]Simon Littlefaith, "How I Kept My Faith During College Years," The Sunday School Times 73 (March 7, 1931): 134

[62]Paul Campbell, "Christ in a Canadian University," The Sunday School Times 75 (March 25, 1933): 211-212; and Paul Gratton Guinness, "Will College Students Listen to the Gospel?" The Sunday School Times 77 (June 1, 1935): 373-374, 383

[63]George T. B. Davis, "Giving God's Word to School and College Students," The Sunday School Times 75 (August 5, 1933): 495-496; and J. A. Morris Kimber, "Fighting College Doubts," in The Victorious Life: Messages From the Summer Conferences (Philadelphia: The Board of Managers of Victorious Life conference, 1918, reprinted by Garland Publishing, 1988), pp. 340-342.

[64]"Scholarship and Faith," Moody Monthly 32 (December 1931): 208.

But not all fundamentalists agreed that a Christian young person could stand against the onslaught of modernistic ideology. Some argued that college students (Christian and non-Christian alike) do not think, but merely hang on every word and godless notion their professors throw at them. The question, "Does the average college student think?", is thus answered, "No! he merely drinks --- from the cup of blind credulity, which gives an intoxication that relieves him from the acknowledgement of responsibility to God."[65] The fear that Christian young people were easily led away from belief in the Bible was also illustrated in cartoon advertisements such as one for the Standard Publishing Company which depicts a boy studying the Bible with a quote from Longfellow which says, "It is the heart, and not the brain, that to the highest doth attain."[66] Chicago Daily News cartoonist, Vaughn C. Shoemaker, attempted to remind young Christian students of the necessity of personal piety through the study of the Bible in a cartoon entitled, "Students - -- How Wise Are You?" The cartoon depicts two young men studying, one surrounded by mountains of scholarly books, the other reading only the Bible. The caption next to the student surrounded by books states, "Books to prepare for life," while the caption next to the Bible student says, "Book to prepare for eternal

---

[65]Verna Smith Teeuwissen, "Do College Students Think?" Moody Monthly 38 (September, 1937): 12

[66]Advertisement for the Standard Publishing Company, Moody Monthly 34 (October, 1933): 79

life."[67] The fear of modernism and biblical infidelity was consistently reinforced for young people in advertisements for Christian schools deemed safe by the fundamentalist hierarchy. The main objective was to show how to "Avoid the Menace of College Modernism."[68] Lengthy lists of "safe" Bible schools were also periodically published in order to inform fundamentalists of where the authoritative word of God was being taught.[69] The suspicion that fundamentalists had of modern learning worked itself out in organized meetings they sponsored in the early years of the movement.

---

[67]Vaughn C. Shoemaker, "Students How Wise Are You?" Evangelical Beacon 7 (September 6, 1938): Cover feature.

[68]"A Challenging Opportunity to Avoid the Menace of College Modernism." Advertisement for the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary in Watchman-Examiner 18 (May 22, 1930): 649; Wilbur M. Smith, "They Teach the Gospel in Dallas," Revelation 2 (December 1932): 487; 514-515; Trumbull expressed concern that many theological seminaries deliberately trained students "to scoff at the idea that the whole Bible is the Word of God--and thus they are trained to scoff at God." See Trumbull, Prophecy's Light on Today, p. 94.

[69]"Bible Schools that are True to the Faith," The Sunday School Times 72 (February 1, 1930): 63; James E. Bennet, "Starvation by Philosophy," Moody Monthly (September, 1942): 7-9, 42-43; Charles A. Blanchard, president of Wheaton College, encouraged Christians "not only to have no fellowship with . . . infidel atheistic education," but rather, "To seek out institutions which endeavor to be faithful to the Word of God." Quoted in William Vance Trollinger, God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), p. 39; William Bell Riley was very concerned that there were few denominational colleges where one could send their children with confidence that orthodox Christianity would be taught. See Riley, The Menace of Modernism, p. 115; Wheaton College was considered a safe school where parents could send their children without the fear that they would become indoctrinated with ungodly teaching. See "An Unafraid College," The Advisor (June 12, 1935), "A Newsletter from the Advisory Associates, Chicago. IL." (Wheaton College Archives, Box 13, File 15.).

Prior to the Northern Baptist Convention meeting in Buffalo, New York, June 1920, a number of fundamentalist ministers assembled to establish the conference agenda. Included in the agenda was a resolution "to investigate the teachings in all secondary schools, colleges, and theological seminaries seeking either financial support or the moral sponsorship of Baptist churches in the bounds of the Northern Baptist Convention."[70] A desire to warn students about unsafe textbooks was also in the agenda of the fundamentalist leadership as it was in a published program of a conference on Christian fundamentals in Philadelphia (1919) entitled, God Hath Spoken, which attempted to identify modernism and uproot it, books and all.[71] Some were so angry about the evil of modernistic textbooks that they attempted to build a case for book burning.[72] The consequences of not heeding

---

[70]The following two resolutions read, a) To investigate the statement of beliefs submitted by the schools to the teachers therein upon their employment. b) To give special attention to the question of whether these schools and individual teachers are still loyal to the great fundamental Baptist truths as held by the denomination in the past, with particular reference to the inspiration of the Word of God, the deity of Christ, the atonement, the resurrection, the return of the Lord, the spiritual nature of the church, the necessity for a regenerated, baptized church membership, the unchanged nature of the obligation of the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and the imperative responsibility of carrying out the Great Commission. Quoted in Robert A. Ashworth, "The Fundamentalist Movement Among the Baptists," The Journal of Religion 4 (November 1924): 611-631.

[71]Kenneth K. Bailey, Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 49.

[72]"The Burning of the Books," Serving and Waiting 23 (July 1933): 59.

the warning signs were devastating for some families, such as in the case of an old minister and his wife whose son went off to a denominational college a confessed believer and came home four years later a "middle-aged. . . drunken atheist bum."[73] The concern for the waywardness of their young men was but one problem fundamentalist parents faced in their war with modernism. Concern was also expressed over the corruption of their daughters by the communists. As one brokenhearted father put it, "In our state colleges and in the towns around them are shrewd gentry who have their eyes on your daughter. You can't afford to laugh at them--as I did," or as "a thousand other fathers who see their daughters put on the road to hell--too late."[74] The road to modernism was not always perceived to be paved by intellectual assaults against the faith of Christian young people. More often than not, Christian young people fall by the wayside as a result of indulging in sensual thoughts and activities. Many of these activities included dancing, the movie theater, cigarette smoking, marijuana smoking, booze, and sex. Once one ceases to pray daily, study the Bible, worship and meditate, he runs the risk of becoming "so spiritually anaemic that he catches every germ of disordered

---

[73]"Bob Jones on Infidelity in Education," The Christian Fundamentalist 5 (August, 1931): 63-64

[74]J.G. Shaw, "Will the Communists Get Our Girls in College?" Liberty (May 18, 1934): 12-15.

imagining which comes his way."[75]

Perhaps the greatest concern among fundamentalists, in their suspicion of modern learning, was the reconciliation of the Bible with science.[76] Evangelicals utilized the paradigms of Baconian science and Common Sense philosophy, the two dominant scientific and philosophical paradigms in the first half of the nineteenth century, as a basis for defending the faith.[77] Evangelicals in the late nineteenth century appeared to be caught off guard when evolutionary theory crashed onto the shores of American higher education. Despite the struggles that evangelicals had with the impact of enlightenmental rationalism and deism during the eighteenth century, they had still managed to hold a position of authority regarding theological and scientific

---

[75]"A Christian College" Inaugural Address of President James Oliver Buswell, Jr., June 15, 1926. Bulletin of Wheaton College 4 (November 1926): 1-8; John Carrara, The Enemies of Youth (Fundamental Truth Publishers, 1939); J.A. Morris Kimber, "The Attitude of the Surrendered Christian Toward Motion Pictures," Christ Life or the Word of the Cross 1 (March 1925): 97-101; and Reginald Wallis, The New Man: Talks to Christian Young Men (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1931).

[76]One notable exception to the rule were the holiness and pentecostal groups that relegated to a secondary concern, the issue of evolutionism. They were far more concerned about soul winning and holy living. See Ronald L. Numbers, "Creationism, Evolution, and the Holy Ghost Religion: Holiness and Pentecostal Responses to Darwinism," Religion and American Culture 2 (Summer, 1992): 127-158.

[77]Theodore Dwight Bozeman, Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977), pp. 3-31; and Mark A. Noll, "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought," in American Quarterly 37 (Summer, 1985): 216-238.

issues. Despite the problems that Darwinism created for the evangelical establishment there still existed an overcoming confidence that "the gates of hell would not overcome the Church." This, perhaps, helped to create an atmosphere that eventually leant itself to a kind of intellectual apathy among the evangelical intelligentsia. Another possibility is that the American evangelical theological community in the nineteenth century was more concerned about debating in-house evangelical issues than in engaging in critical dialogue with the developing intellectual trends of their day.[78]

The generation of conservatives that brought forth the fundamentalist movement after World War I, as we have already shown, had little respect for any scholarship that was not hinged upon the authority of the Bible. While it was common place for fundamentalists to critique evolutionary theory on biblical grounds, rarely were they willing, or able, to do the hands-on scientific research necessary for truly understanding it.[79] This generation of fundamentalists refused to consider the possibility that there might be some truth connected to evolutionary theory. The generation that preceded them, although not identified as fundamentalists in their time, had a greater respect for scientific investigation. The theologian, Charles Hodge,

---

[78]John D. Woodbridge, et, al., The Gospel in America: Themes in the Story of America's Evangelicals (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), p. 62.

[79]Ibid., p. 64.

wrote an early rebuttal against Darwinism entitled What is Darwinism? (1874). Hodge attempted to show that Darwin's system is atheistic because it denies design in the creation.[80] Hodge's response to Darwinism was considered to be the standard work by which all other critiques were judged. Other evangelical respondents differed from Hodge on the question of evolution. Henry B. Smith agreed half way with Hodge arguing that there was at least some room for evolution as long as it was under the control of God. Some evangelical scholars attempted to carry evolutionary theory further, thus allowing for even greater forms of evolutionary development.[81] Interestingly, George Frederick Wright and James Orr were both proponents of varying forms of theistic evolution, and both wrote articles for the twelve volume set, The Fundamentals (1910-1915). In an age when modernism was under such fierce attack by conservative Christians, it seems inconsistent that these liberal views were tolerated.[82] This calls into question just how attentive the post-World War I fundamentalists were to the

---

[80]Livingstone, Darwin's Forgotten Defenders, pp. 103-104.

[81] These scholars included Asa Gray, James Orr, and George Frederick Wright, see Woodbridge, The Gospel in America, pp. 61-65; Jack Rogers and Donald McKim, The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979), p. 297; Glen G. Scorgie, A Call for Continuity: The Theological Contribution of James Orr (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988); and Livingstone, Darwin's Forgotten Defenders.

[82]Livingstone, Darwin's Forgotten Defenders, pp. 147-154.

fact that The Fundamentals contained what they themselves considered to be heresy. Despite the major differences between evangelical scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was a time in the history of American evangelicalism when evangelical scholarship was taken seriously.[83]

The Scopes trial of 1925 was considered by some to be the final showdown between fundamentalism and modernism, a confrontation that would not drive the final nail in the coffin of fundamentalism, but rather reduced it to a laughingstock.[84] Negative characterizations of fundamentalists as a backward, anti-intellectual primitivists were popularized by writers like H.L. Mencken, who wrote that fundamentalists "constituted, perhaps, the most ignorant class of teachers ever to set up to lead a civilized people." These same people get their training at low level institutions which can be found "in every mountain valley of the land, with its single building in a bare pasture lot, and its faculty of half-idiot pedagogues and broken-down preachers." Fundamentalism, from Mencken's point of view, is not difficult to understand once you've had a chance to scrutinize it. Whatever the fundamentalist cannot understand he casts off as unintelligible. "He is

---

[83]Woodbridge, The Gospel, p. 64; and Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, pp. 11-31.

[84]Joel A. Carpenter, "Contending for the Faith Once Delivered: Primitivist Impulses in American Fundamentalism," in The American Quest for the Primitive Church, Richard T. Hughes, ed., (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), pp. 99-119.

suspicious of it---afraid of it---and he quickly communicates his fears to his dupes. . .they are specialists in alarms and bugaboos."[85] Maynard Shipley, who entered into public debate with numerous fundamentalists on the issue of evolutionary science, determined that "For the first time in our history, organized knowledge has come into conflict with organized ignorance."[86] To say, based upon these kinds of criticisms, that fundamentalists were completely anti-intellectual and anti-scientific would be somewhat short-sighted.[87] Human reason and science were legitimate to fundamentalists, but only under the authority of the Bible. Upon this basis, fundamentalists constructed their system of thought.[88] Fundamentalism after the Scopes trial found itself with far less credibility due to the

---

[85]Quoted in Maynard Shipley's The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attack on Evolution and Modernism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), pp. 114-115; Mencken referred to the Scopes trial spectators as "gaping primates," and "anthropoid rabble" who identified and supported Bryan the "inflammatory half wit." See David H. Bennett, The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), p. 207.

[86]Ibid., p. 4.

[87]It has been argued that the fundamentalists were not ignorant about, or indifferent to the fruits of science and technology. They drove cars like everyone else, they utilized electricity, radios, and machine made goods such as clothing. There was also a representation of credible scientists among them. "What wounded them was the assualt that science made on the ancient story from which their sense of moral order sprang." See Neil Postman, Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), pp. 49-50.

[88]Wenger, "Social Thought in American Fundamentalism," p. 113; and Shipley, The War, p. 5.

widespread coverage it had received. Marsden has shown that the "bizarre developments in fundamentalist activities meant that in the years after 1925 it became increasingly difficult to take fundamentalism seriously." It is difficult to attribute to the decline of post-1925 fundamentalism only one factor, yet, "It does appear, however, that the movement began in reality to conform to its popular image. The more ridiculous it was made to appear, the more genuinely ridiculous it was likely to become."[89]

In the years following the Scopes fiasco, fundamentalists deferred to science merely to show that "the revelations of the Bible" were not out of harmony with its findings when correct thinking and observation were applied.[90] Contrary to popular characterizations that fundamentalists believed that the Bible was a science book, many fundamentalists openly acknowledged that the Bible was not intended (by God) to be a science book, yet, where the Bible speaks of science, it speaks truthfully. In an article entitled, "Is the Science of the Bible Wrong?", Earle A. Rowell points out that the Bible is not "concerned to teach the details of science." Yet science would be far more advanced if it had accepted the authority of the Bible

---

[89]Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 191.

[90]William J. Barnes, "The Bible and Modern Science," Serving and Waiting 19 (January 1930): 308-310; and Harvey Cox, Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Postmodern Theology (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 40.

for its starting premise. The bottom line was the fact that modern science did not have the ability to answer the ultimate questions of life. "The thousands of volumes of science do not help the soul on its deathbed." The greatest science of all, therefore, is "the science of salvation," which gives hope to those in despair and those who are dying. Physical science is only alluded to in the Bible insofar as it is useful for ministering and winning lost souls.[91] The book of Genesis, in the minds of some fundamentalists, proves to mankind that nature has no power of its own, but are only created "things" from God. The book of Genesis, therefore, can only be seen as "the A B C of science." Any conclusions of science that do not agree with the book of Genesis cannot be considered scientific, but only mere speculations.[92] Themes centering around the accuracy of the Bible on scientific matters were commonly used to encourage the faith of fundamentalists who had been put on guard against the insidious forces of modernism. Contrary to those who would argue that the Bible was not a science book, still others attempted to show how the Bible

---

[91]Earle A. Rowell, "Is the Science of the Bible Wrong?" Signs of the Times 52 (November 3, 1925): 3, 12; Roland E. Loasby, "The Bible Scientifically Accurate," Signs of the Times 61 (May 22, 1934): 1, 14; Fundamentalists typically argued that persistent prayer and Bible study will help one to find God, not scientific investigation. see T. Richardson Gray, "Faith Superior to Science," Moody Monthly 34 (November 1933): 100; and John R. Rice, Verbal Inspiration of the Bible and its Scientific Accuracy (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1943), pp. 2-28.

[92]James I. Robison, "Genesis and Intellectual Freedom," Signs of the Times 52 (October 6, 1925): 4-5.

was "the world's greatest text-book on science." The book of Genesis was the most reliable account of creation, in the mind of one apologist, who argued further that the book of "Genesis is the only text-book on creation, and it is the greatest authority on geology. There is no conflict between the Bible and true science."[93] The attitude of some fundamentalist scholars sometimes appeared to be overly confident with absolutist statements claiming that scientific facts never contradict the scriptures. Whenever you find that science does not harmonize with the Bible, "stick to the Bible," for eventually, "time will vindicate the Bible."[94] Another way fundamentalists approached the issues of modern science was to defer to the Bible directly, showing, for example, "Paul's appeal to Timothy to avoid oppositions of science falsely so-called is as powerful in 1932 as ever."[95] It was not uncommon to hear fundamentalist leaders respond to modernists in a sarcastic, ad hominem manner. This attitude, stemming in part from intellectual intimidation, was also indicative of the confidence they had in the authority of the Bible to answer all modernistic claims.

William Bell Riley serves as the most flamboyant

---

[93]G.W. McPherson, The Crisis in the Church (Yonkers, N.Y., 1919), pp. 111-113.

[94]James E. Ely, Glimpses of Bible Climaxes from the Beginning to the End (Garden City: Businessman's Gospel Association, 1927), pp. 135-136.

[95]"What is a Scientist?", Serving and Waiting 22 (June 1932): 32.

example of fundamentalistic wit and sarcasm in his debates with prominent evolutionists. His opponents included Maynard Shipley, President of the Science League of America, Edward Adams Cantrell of the Civil Liberties Union of America, and Charles C. Smith of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism.[96] Riley had the skills to play a crowd for all they were worth, often times in a very entertaining fashion.[97] Once in a debate with Charles Smith, Riley took command, bringing the house down in laughter after turning the tables on Smith, causing his mockery to backfire.[98] Such antics, however, had a backfiring effect on the image of fundamentalism itself. Fewer and fewer in the greater academic community could take fundamentalism seriously in light of these side shows. It was precisely this kind of image and mentality that turned University of Kentucky President, Frank McVey, away from debating the evolution issue with J.W. Porter, Pastor of Lexington First Baptist Church. McVey was determined, in the name of academic freedom, to fight the Kentucky anti-evolution legislation of 1922, and soon found himself the

---

[96]C. Allyn Russell, Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), pp. 94-95.

[97]Ibid., pp. 88, 94.

[98]Apparently, Smith showed up to a debate in New Orleans with a gorilla dressed up in a suit, wearing patent leather shoes, and also holding a bottle of booze. Riley whimsically retorted, "I came down here to meet Charles Smith, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. Since my arrival I find I have to meet the Smith brothers." Quoted in Trollinger, God's Empire, p. 47.

object of Porter's wrath. It was suggested that he debate with Porter, but declined the offer with the realization that his opponent was able to stir up the emotions of the uneducated crowd to whom he appealed.[99] Most of these debates served the purpose of entertainment more than education,[100] furthering the image of fundamentalists as podunk agrarian, anti-intellectuals. Debate winners were even determined by the volume of the applause from the audience. Riley usually won because he made sure to fill the debate halls with friends and supporters.[101]

This kind of bombastic display was reminiscent of the antics of William Jennings Bryan at the Scopes trial, and the crowd-pleasing stunts of the evangelist Billy Sunday. Sunday especially played the popular audience with his vaudeville acrobatics and emotional appeal.[102] Consistent with a long line of anti-educational fundamentalists, Sunday reinforced his suspicion of modern learning by expressing fierce antagonism toward modern scholarship. His official biographer, William T. Ellis, described him as sitting "in God's judgment seat in almost every sermon and frequently

---

[99]William E. Ellis, "Frank LeRond McVey: His Defense of Academic Freedom," The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society 67 (January 1969): 37-54.

[100]Russell, Voices, p. 94.

[101]Ibid., p. 95.

[102]Lyle W. Dorsett, Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 85-123.

sends men to hell by name."[103] Threats of hell were also thrown at students. "Thousands of college graduates are going as fast as they can straight to hell. If I had a million dollars I'd give $999,999 to the Church and $1 to education." Sunday was convinced that whenever there is a conflict between scholarship and the Bible, "scholarship can go to hell!"[104]

Integral to our theme is the fact that fundamentalists constructed their world view around the notion of the full and final authority of the Bible. Thus, it is not difficult to see why the laity put their trust in the scientific opinions of lesser trained fundamentalist scholars, who, of course, held the Bible to be literally authoritative. Because fundamentalists in the 1920s and 1930s had few, if any, legitimate scholars to turn to for their defense, they learned to rely on the polemical insights of popular scholars like Harry Rimmer, founder of the "Research Science Bureau," Dudley Joseph Witney and L. Allen Higley of the "Religion and Science Association," and George McCready Price of the "Society For the Study of Deluge Geology and Related Sciences."[105] These

---

[103]William T. Ellis, Billy Sunday: The Man and His Message (Authorized Edition: L.T. Meyers, 1914), p. 123.

[104]Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism, p. 122.

[105]Mark A. Kalthoff, "Evangelical Scientists: The American Scientific Affiliation as the Twentieth-Century American Interface Between Science and Christianity." A paper presented at the Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals conference on "Evangelicals, Voluntary Associations, & American Public Life," (Wheaton College, June 13-15, 1991), footnote 7.

organizations, though thriving and popular for a while, ultimately failed to put fundamentalists on the road map of credibility.

Perhaps the most outspoken of those mentioned above was Harry Rimmer. A Presbyterian minister and apologist by trade, Rimmer took it upon himself to establish the "Research Science Bureau" in 1920 for the sake of refuting evolutionary theory on a popular level. His Book, The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science (1935), served this purpose, especially for the many Christian college students who were surrounded by the forces of modernism. The book, in Rimmer's words, was to be used as "ammunition in defense of the truth."[106] Rimmer's confidence in the authority of the Bible was the basis for his claim that with every scientific discovery, the Bible can be shown to have anticipated it. He argued this point when the X-Ray-microscope was invented, using as his proof-text Hebrews 11:3. "By faith we understand that the worlds were made by the word of God, so that things which are seen are not made of things that do appear." In other words, the things which are visible to the eye, are made up of things, when broken down, that are invisible. The biblical writers could not have known such scientific facts except by the Holy Spirit's illumination.[107] It was precisely this kind of confidence

---

[106]Harry Rimmer, The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1935), prefatory note.

[107]Harry Rimmer, "Current Science and the Eternal Word," The Christian Fundamentalist 5 (June 1932): 421.

that gave William Bell Riley the wherewithal to attempt to prove the fallacy of evolutionary theory by way of mathematics.[108] William Jennings Bryan also felt the freedom to go into the ring as an eyewitness against evolutionism regardless of his lack of professional training. He stood behind the authority of the Bible and that was sufficient enough in any arena. He denied allegations that he was too incompetent to argue the case in favor of biblical creationism, and often resorted to showing off his own academic credentials to prove he was not an uneducated prima donna. He once stated that if people didn't stop calling him an ignoramus he was going to have all of his degrees printed on his business cards and "challenge any son of an ape to match cards" with him.[109]

It appears that fundamentalists like Riley, Rimmer, and Bryan felt they had every right to speak out authoritatively on issues of which they had little or no professional training since they embraced the authority of the Bible and had the blessings of the popular fundamentalist constituency. Yet this was reciprocal. Fundamentalists, like politicians, did the will of the people, but also molded the people's opinions. These same fundamentalist leaders, when faced with difficult intellectual questions,

---

[108]William Bell Riley, "The Theory of Evolution Tested by Mathematics," The Christian Fundamentalist 5 (June 1932): 425-432.

[109]Quoted in Ronald L. Numbers, The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), p. 43.

had the tendency "to play them out before a popular audience."[110] Critics typically wrote fundamentalists off as ignorant, uneducated yokels, but this simply was not the case. Most fundamentalist leaders were educated enough to legitimately keep themselves out of the ranks of the ignorant, but their myopic shortsightedness often rendered obsolete the little educational preparation they had gained. Popular fundamentalist leaders knew perfectly well that the success of their cause was wrapped up in their ability to control the religious populous. Like well seasoned politicians, fundamentalist leaders were keeping their constituents well fed on a steady diet of conservative nostalgia and the promise that everything would be all right.

So then, fundamentalists during the 1920s and 1930s articulated a suspicion of modern learning that was based upon the full authority of the Bible which they considered the basis for all life and learning. They were suspicious, in particular, of evolutionary science, atheistic philosophy, and liberal interpretations of the Bible. The authority of the Bible had already been dismissed as scientifically and intellectually incredible. It was precisely at this point that fundamentalists determined that

---

[110]Nathan O. Hatch, "Evangelicalism as a Democratic Movement," in Evangelicalism and Modern America, George Marsden, ed., (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 79; For an in depth analysis of the democratization process of American fundamentalism, see Nathan O. Hatch, The Democratization of American Christianity (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), pp. 210-219.

any knowledge which is not based upon the Bible is not "true" knowledge. By the 1920s, fundamentalism had become a popular movement that placed greater value in the biblically informed opinions of the common man than in the speculations of ungodly intellectuals. Historians have marked the 1920s as a time when fundamentalism faced its Waterloo at the Scopes trial in 1925. The fundamentalists won the battle, but ultimately lost the war thereby acquiring the negative image of anti-intellectualism.

William Jennings Bryan embodied the principle theme of fundamentalist populism in his own display of confidence in being able to use the Bible, as an untrained layman, to disprove the theory of evolution in court.[111] Although there were mixed opinions on the question of whether or not the Bible is a science book, it can still be shown that fundamentalists saw the Bible as scientifically accurate. Fundamentalists would remain ambivalent about scholarship through the 1930s, exemplified by their almost total lack of involvement in scholarly activity. The movement itself was by no means put to rest, at least on a popular level. It proved to be a rapidly growing movement as exemplified through the growth of Bible schools, Bible conferences, revivalism, missions, and radio broadcasting.[112] The intellectual activity among fundamentalists was found almost

---

[111]Postman, Technopoly, p. 78.

[112]Joel A. Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945" (Ph.D dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1984).

exclusively in Bible schools and seminaries, but this activity was in no way comparable to the activities of the greater academic community. As we have already indicated, fundamentalists were more concerned about preparing for the second coming of Christ through an increased activity of soul-winning, showing little care about the concerns of this world. "What does it profit a man if he gains the world, but loses his very soul?", or, as someone once put it, "Only one life will soon be past, only what's done for Christ will last!" God was concerned that all men come to Him through Christ. Modern scholarship, in the minds of fundamentalists, had tried to render this message obsolete. Fearing the spread of the ungodly ideology of modernism, fundamentalists attempted to warn their children about the evils of modern learning and the necessity of holding fast to the principles of the word of God. As an extension to this warning, it was common to hear fundamentalists encourage their young people to pursue full-time Christian service vocations.

But the time for the reformation of fundamentalism was at hand. The decade of the 1940s would play host to a new generation of evangelicals who would make every attempt to reform the anti-social, anti-intellectual image of American fundamentalism.[113] The founding of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) in 1941 paralleled the growth of this

---

[113]George M. Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

newly emerging generation indicating an irenic move toward a broader, less separatistic and more tolerant coalition of evangelical Christians.[114] The new evangelicals had a specific agenda to renew evangelicalism's rightful place in the marketplace of truth. Perhaps the most profound indication of the change in attitude toward scholarship was the significant increase in graduate work by evangelicals at major universities during the 1940s and 1950s, many of whom attended Harvard Divinity School.[115] The move toward renewal, however, would not be an easy task for this new generation of evangelicals. Their first task was to move beyond the obscurantistic posture of their fundamentalist predecessors, and attempt to reconstruct a classical orthodoxy that could be defended with intellectual credibility that could place them once again in the marketplace of truth.

---

[114]Evangelical Action: A Report of the Organization of the National Association of Evangelicals For United Action. Compiled and edited by the executive committee (Boston: United Action Press, 1942); and James Deforest Murch, Cooperation without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

[115]Hatch, "Evangelicalism as a Democratic Movement," p. 79.

Chapter Two

The New Evangelical Repudiation of Fundamentalism: Unified Agenda or Conflicting Ideals?

> Nothing can be learned from general wisdom, says the fundamentalist, for the natural man is wrong in starting point, method, and conclusion. . . . Since the fundamentalist belittles the value of general wisdom, he is often content with an educational system that substitutes piety for scholarship.[1]

By the end of the 1930s, fundamentalism had been reduced to a movement of utter insignificance, at least in the eyes of American society at large. As we have already seen, fundamentalists had separated themselves from a world conquered by an insidious army of modernists. They had given up trying to make an impact in higher educational circles, most noticeable in their turn of attention to biblically faithful seminaries and Bible schools. Their world was a fortress in which the elect could safely await the return of Christ, followed by the avenging wrath of God on those who made war against them. It was precisely this general attitude among separatist fundamentalists that caused the new evangelical generation to recoil in dismay. As we saw in chapter one, post-World War I fundamentalism was a closed system that placed the authority of the Word of God above all things. Though they have been accused of being anti-intellectuals, it may be more proper to say that

---

[1]Edward John Carnell, The Case for Orthodox Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), p. 119.

they were selectively intellectual. Fundamentalists of this generation saw intellectual pursuits as valid only if the pursuits were contingent upon the authority of the Bible. The following generation of new evangelicals were no less committed to the authority of the Bible, yet they differed because they sought to find truth in areas where no fundamentalist dared venture. The term "new evangelicalism," however, would not be the label given to this emerging generation of reformers of fundamentalism until 1947.[2]

The new evangelicals emerged from a tumultuous period in American history. They, like millions of other Americans, witnessed the dark days of the Great Depression, the horrors of World War II, and the uncertain days of the Cold War with its looming threat of atomic destruction. Indeed, these recent events helped to mold the mindset of the new evangelicals as they set out to reform fundamentalism. They were a part of an American society that felt many uncertainties about the future of the United States[3]. For many new evangelicals the experience of World

---

[2]Harold John Ockenga was the first to publically refer to the post-1940 generation as "new evangelicals." See Harold John Ockenga, "From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism," in Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith. Kenneth Kantzer, ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1978), pp. 35-46; and Robert P. Lightner, Neo-Evangelicalism (Findlay: Dunham Publishing, 1962), p.39.

[3]William Graebner, The Age of Doubt: American Thought and Culture in the 1940s (Boston: Twayne, 1991); Loren Baritz, The Good Life: The Meaning of Success for the

War II (along with World War I) and the atomic age presented to them the sickness of western civilization and the great need to evangelize lost sinners.[4]

The seeds for the new evangelical movement were sown in 1942 when the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) came into existence. Under the guidance of J. Elwin Wright and Harold John Ockenga the NAE was to become a coalition of conservative evangelicals brought together in an irenic spirit of cooperation. They were convinced that the years of separatistic negativism within fundamentalism had done more damage than good in the venture to build Christ's kingdom. They, like their fundamentalist predecessors, rejected the liberal agenda of the ecumenical Federal Council of Churches,[5] but refused to separate from other evangelicals whom stricter fundamentalists would lump in with modernists in the ecumenical movement.

Perhaps the most explicit symbol of NAE commitment to a spirit of cooperation was its rejection of a plan, on behalf of the prominent separatist Carl McIntire and a few of his colleagues, to get the NAE to unite with their already established separatist American Council of Christian

---

Baritz, The Good Life: The Meaning of Success for the American Middle Class (New York: Harper & Row, 1990).

[4]Carl F. H. Henry, The Remaking of the Modern Mind (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948)[1946]; Wilbur M. Smith, The Atomic Age and the Word of God (Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1948).

[5]James DeForest Murch, Cooperation Without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), pp. 38-47.

Churches. The NAE council rejected the offer, which resulted in the immediate withdraw of the American Council representatives from the meeting.[6] From here on the course was set for a new evangelical spirit that would make itself manifest in the political arena, religious broadcasting, foreign missions, evangelism, home missions, stewardship, Christian education, and social action.[7] Closest to the heart of the new evangelical coalition were the issues of social action and intellectual credibility. It was in these two arenas where the new evangelicals saw fundamentalism's most inadequate spirit. Years of polemical in-house warfare over the issues surrounding modernism had created for American fundamentalists a ghetto mentality that not only manifested itself in forms of anti-intellectualism, but in anti-social mentalities as well. The new evangelical agenda was best summarized in an article in Christian Life magazine entitled, "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" The article points out how fundamentalism had declined since the days of scholarly J. Gresham Machen to a movement that became "the catch-all for the lunatic fringe" after 1925. A new

---

[6]The American Council of Christian Churches, led by Carl McIntire, was an extreme separatist group that would eventually wage an all-out war against the NAE and the emerging new evangelical coalition. See Evangelical Action: A Report of the Organization of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action. (Boston: United Action Press, 1942), pp. 6-7.

[7]Ibid; Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism," pp. 184-221; Louis Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1963]; and Murch, Cooperation Without Compromise.

generation had emerged after World War II, desiring a more positive impact. The identifiable earmarks of this new generation included a willingness to study science more seriously; take social responsibility seriously; tolerance of different opinions on eschatology; renewed emphasis on critical scholarship; the repudiation of dispensationalism; and the willingness to converse with liberal scholars.[8] The new evangelicals understood these problems and sought to remedy them through preparing themselves intellectually for the task of reforming fundamentalism.

The term "new evangelicalism" was first used by Ockenga in 1947 at a convocation address at Fuller Seminary. This new movement, according to Ockenga, was generated in response to the fundamentalist abandonment of social and intellectual concerns. What made the new evangelicals different from the fundamentalists was their willingness to apply the principles of the Christian faith to the social and intellectual needs of the day. Ockenga made clear that the new evangelicalism was not about separation but rather "infiltration" so as to effect positive changes within the evangelical community. Unlike fundamentalism, the new evangelicalism would give a positive presentation of the truth of the gospel, thereby bringing into union the goodness of the social gospel and the truth of the "personal

---

[8]"Is Evangelical Theology Changing?", Christian Life, (March 1967): 16-19.

gospel."[9] Ockenga, and his new evangelical peers, were convinced that the new evangelicalism was intellectually credible and could be defended on the same grounds. There is no reason why evangelicals need to be afraid of science or any other form of modern scholarship. Unquestionably, evangelicals should apply the faith to every aspect of life. Ockenga's speech was centered around six points with regards to the background of the founding of the new evangelicalism. First, it has been given a voice to be heard in the denominations through the vehicle of the National Association of Evangelicals. Second, the help of the World Evangelical Fellowship which helps to bring together the national groups. Third, the emergence of insightful apologetic literature that promotes new evangelical values. Fourth, the existence of seminaries like Fuller where evangelical orthodoxy is taught along side of a relevant social agenda. Fifth, establishment of the new evangelical voice Christianity Today. Sixth, the leading spokesman for the new evangelicalism, the evangelist Billy Graham.[10] Time would tell, however, as to how unified the new evangelicals would be in defining the scope of the new evangelical vision

---

[9]Ockenga, "From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism," p. 40; see also a release of portions of Ockenga's 1947 convocation address at Fuller entitled, "The New Evangelicalism," edited by Edgar W. Pool. Folder 7, Box 16, Collection 8, Records of Christianity Today (hereafter cited as CT Records). Archives of the Billy Graham Center, Wheaton, Illinois (hereafter cited as GA).

[10]Ibid.

for the reformation of fundamentalism. Many in the new evangelical camp would be less than enthusiastic about detaching themselves from fundamentalism.

The core of key players in the new evangelical coalition were few in number, yet the movement itself gained significant numbers during the 1940s and 1950s. The list of those who pursued professional academic credentials in the new evangelical generation is lengthy and impressive because it revealed a radical new commitment to intellectual integrity. The number of new evangelicals who attended Harvard Divinity School is especially impressive. Included in this roster of Harvard graduates were the apologist, Edward John Carnell (Th.D., 1948), who also completed a Ph.D. in philosophy at Boston University in 1949; theologian and former editor of Christianity Today, Kenneth Kantzer (Ph.D., 1950); theologian, Merrill Tenney (Ph.D., 1944); church historian, John Gerstner (Ph.D., 1945); philosopher, Harold Kuhn (Ph.D., 1944); theologian, Paul Jewitt (Ph.D., 1951); New Testament scholar, George Ladd (Ph.D., 1949); Fuller Seminary Provost and New Testament scholar, Glenn Barker (Ph.D., 1962); Gordon-Conwell Dean and Professor, Burton Goddard (Th.D., 1943); theologian, Roger Nicole (Ph.D., 1967); theologian Samuel Schultz (Th.D., 1949); Biblical studies scholar, George Turner (Ph.D., 1946); Greek scholar, J. Harold Greenlee (Ph.D., 1947); theologian, Jack P. Lewis (Ph.D., 1953); and church

historian, Lemoine Lewis (Ph.D., 1959).[11]

As the numbers of evangelical students grew at Harvard Divinity School, it became clear to Dean William L. Sperry that this kind of student "already had one theological course in a conservative-to-fundamentalist seminary, and who is now anxious to begin all over again another three years of theological re-education."[12] Why the sudden interest in Harvard is not entirely clear, yet what is clear is that at least some of those listed above attended Harvard strictly for the intellectual challenge.[13] Years of intellectual uncertainty and obscurantism had been burned into the frontal lobes of this new generation and, as Rudolph Nelson argues, "Young men who had progressed far enough on the academic ladder to seriously contemplate graduate education could hardly have avoided at least thinking of Harvard." [14] Attitudinally, fundamentalists had always thought of Harvard as the dwellingplace of Satan, echoing what Jack P. Lewis said regarding what he and other evangelical students would find at Harvard. They anticipated meeting the Devil himself, but instead found "gentlemen of the highest

---

[11]Rudolph L. Nelson, "Fundamentalism at Harvard: The Case of Edward John Carnell," Quarterly Review 2 (Summer 1982): 80-81.

[12]Ibid., p. 79.

[13]Rudolph Nelson, The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind: The Case of Edward Carnell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 57-59.

[14]Ibid., p. 57.

character who were kinder to us than we would have been to them had the case been reversed."[15] Others in the new evangelical coalition sought professional degrees elsewhere. Harold John Ockenga earned a Ph.D in philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh in 1939 and Carl F.H. Henry earned his Ph.D in philosophy at Boston University in 1949. Bernard Ramm earned both an M.A. and a Ph.D at the University of Southern California. A number of new evangelicals took an alternative course of study in theology.

Dan Fuller, son of the famous radio evangelist Charles Fuller, studied at Princeton Seminary, University of California at Berkeley, and earned a Th.D from the University of Basel in Switzerland. In theology, Fuller along with Bernard Ramm and Donald Bloesch, represented a move away from fundamentalist orthodoxy to a system more sympathetic toward neo-orthodoxy. Each of them had studied with Karl Barth, whom many in the new evangelical coalition regarded as less than orthodox. This diversity was merely the logical outcome of the earlier seeds of renewal that had been planted in the early 1940s. It is important to note at this point that the new evangelicals developed their love for academe in fundamentalist institutions of higher learning. A number of key new evangelical leaders received their initial intellectual training at institutions like

---

[15]Ibid., p. 58.

Wheaton College and Westminster Theological Seminary. Perhaps the most influential teacher for the new evangelical generation (especially for Wheaton graduates) was the reformed apologist Gordon H. Clark. Carl Henry points out that Clark "made a lasting contribution to a score of young scholars who were to articulate Christian theism aggressively in the contemporary milieu." Besides Carnell and himself, Henry also cites other new evangelicals influenced by Clark such as "Edmund P. Clowney, Clair Davis, Billy Graham, Paul K. Jewitt, and Robert K. Rudolph." [16] The Influence of J. Gresham Machen and Cornelius Van Til played a significant role as well at Westminster. Carnell and Ockenga both studied at Westminster and gained a great respect for reformed theology. Carnell said that the influence of Clark was much greater on him than was the influence of Van Til. Carnell and Van Til evidently had a falling out in 1944 that never was to be resolved.[17] The anti-dispensationalism attributable to the new evangelicals appears to have its roots, to some extent, in the reformed influences of Clark, Van Til, and Machen. Despite the impressive credentials that the new evangelicals were attaining, there still appeared to be a gross lack of academic concentration outside the discipline of theology.

---

[16]Carl F.H. Henry, "A Wide and Deep Swath," in The Philosophy of Gordon H. Clark: A Festschrift. Ronald N. Nash, ed. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1968), p. 16.

[17]Nelson, The Making and Unmaking, p. 45.

This comes as no secret since it appears that the first order of business was to attempt to resolve the numerous theological conflicts of their fundamentalist predecessors at a more scholarly level. Some new evangelicals were majoring in philosophy for the sole purpose of developing an irrefutable apologetic.

The development of the new evangelicalism has been identified, institutionally, with Fuller Theological Seminary. George Marsden has argued that "The early Fuller was in striking ways a fundamentalist institution with a thoroughly fundamentalist constituency. Though "evangelical" may have been the more respectable word to use, few would have questioned the fundamentalist identification."[18] Most of the new evangelicals wanted to stay true to the fundamentals of the faith without all the superfluous baggage that made the movement unacceptable, yet it is still not clear why they remained committed to a partial identification with a term that communicated the obscurantism they despised. Marsden shows that by the late 1950s, tensions between fundamentalism and the new evangelicalism were eventually played out in the halls of Fuller Seminary, thereby resulting in the fundamentalist withdrawal of support for the seminary because of their fears of modernism.

---

[18]George Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), p. 3.

Carl Henry's path-breaking work, The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (1947), is considered to be the first major critique of the fundamentalist anti-intellectual and anti-social mentality. Fundamentalists, in Henry's analysis, had become so wrapped up in their own scrupulous concerns over non-essential matters that they were unable to develop an agenda for social reform. As a result, non-evangelicals began to view fundamentalism as a movement "which makes a world ethical view impossible."[19] In conjunction with the founding principles of the NAE, Henry wanted to see a contemporary evangelicalism that would apply the gospel message to the "global predicament" at large, focus on those elements of agreement between evangelicals before a watching world, and turn from the unbiblical lack of compassion fundamentalism had developed.[20] The uneasiness that Henry saw in American fundamentalism was, to him, a positive sign. The result, he hoped, would be something tantamount to a twentieth century reformation inevitably "leading to a global renaissance within modern secularism."[21]

Henry's attack upon fundamentalist obscurantism went much deeper in Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology (1957). Fundamentalism, Henry maintains,

---

[19]Carl F.H. Henry, The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), p. 23.

[20]Ibid., p. 57.

[21]Ibid., p. 64.

possesses the truth insofar as its "essential" doctrines are concerned,[22] but "suffered from its own inherent perils."[23] These perils include an historical and theological short-sightedness, the lack of production of relevant theological literature, and a refusal to recognize the great social needs in culture. Henry bemoaned the fact that while some conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists were honest in their approach to scientific issues, most "American fundamentalists expended their energies more in vocal hostility to evolution than in the production of scholarly, meaningful literature."[24] Henry believed that this kind of fundamentalist obscurantism was a thing of the past in light of the resurgence of a new kind of evangelical Christianity. In times past it was common to hear of continual defeats of fundamentalism and "of revealed religion demeaned as fundamentalist cultism and fundamentalism disparaged in turn as sheer anti-intellectualism." Evangelical theology, in Henry's analysis, was reasserting itself with the kind of "vigor and wideness surprising to most interpreters of

---

[22]Essential doctrine, according to the new evangelicals, included such things as the virgin birth , the deity, substitutionary atonement, the death and resurrection of Christ, the inerrancy and authority of the Bible, and the eventual return of Christ. Non-essentials included movie attendance, television, playing cards, studying at unorthodox institutions of higher learning, smoking and drinking.

[23]Carl F.H. Henry, Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 32.

[24]Ibid., p. 42.

contemporary religious life."[25] Perhaps the most scathing attack against fundamentalism came from the pen of E.J. Carnell. Having been raised in a fundamentalist home in Michigan, Carnell knew first hand what it was like living on the inside of the movement. Carnell's controversial career represented, in many ways, the overwhelming tension the new evangelicals felt in their attempt to come to grips with impact of the Age of Reason on the Church, as well as overcoming the intellectual obscurantism of their fundamentalist predecessors. Despite the severe criticism that other new evangelicals were leveling against fundamentalism, Carnell's critique was the most gripping and iconoclastic that this new generation had produced. Rudolph Nelson assesses Carnell's critique as most "influential in shattering the legacy of fundamentalist withdraw from modernity and insisting that evangelicals confront the toughest issues of modern times."[26]

In 1956, Carnell wrote Christian Commitment: An Apologetic, which he felt would make a significant impact, not only on the Church, but in the secular community as well. The book was accepted for publication by a secular press, thereby causing the new evangelicals to celebrate

---

[25]Carl F.H. Henry, "The Resurgence of Evangelical Christianity," Christianity Today 3 (March 30, 1959): 3-6.

[26]Nelson, The Making and Unmaking, p. 8.

their coming of age intellectually.[27] The book referenced few Bible verses but attempted to show that there was a commonality of experience between believers and non-believers. Carnell's desire in Christian Commitment was to make Christianity credible to a culture that had written it off as incredible.[28] Included in this book was an autobiographical overview that Carnell hoped would set the tone for his general theme. He revealed his troubling encounters with insomnia, especially as it affected him in graduate school. Insomnia was the basis of his "omnipresent sense of fatigue, the susceptibility to irritation, and the grossness of an unrefreshed mind." All of this was a mounting powder keg that Carnell says caused him to explode in anger one night while studying for a language examination. After the outburst, Carnell commenced to take a long walk down the railroad tracks leading away from his predicament. After a while he began to contemplate the difference between his inner turmoil and the tranquility of nature, pondering also his sense of finitude. Wanting desperately to escape his turmoil he concludes, "Everything I conceived became a burden; every anticipated obligation threatened to impale me. Even so ordinary a responsibility as conversing with others overwhelmed me with consternation.

---

[27]Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 181; see also Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," Christianity Today (October 10, 1960): 11-15.

[28]Ibid., p. 181.

Nor dare I conceal the fact that even suicide took on a certain attractiveness."[29] All of this led Carnell to conclude (as his thesis for the book) that "One's ability to see reality is somewhat conditioned to the tone of one's affections."[30] Disappointment followed the publication of what Carnell had hoped would be a major contribution to evangelical apologetics. Some of his most outspoken critics were from within the new evangelical camp. For one, Carl Henry expressed his concern over Carnell's book in a letter to Gordon Clark. "What distressed me most is the material in the last chapter which suggests that a knowledge of Christ is not necessary to salvation, and that God may justify individuals apart from reliance upon substitutionary atonement."[31] Clark returned a letter to Henry intimating his own concerns with the book, stating that he was not certain that he wanted to go public in taking issue with Carnell.[32] Later on, Carnell would receive a less than enthusiastic review from Clark who pointed out that Carnell appeared to be moving away from his previously held position

---

[29]Edward John Carnell, Christian Commitment: An Apologetic (New York: MacMillan, 1957), pp. 10-11.

[30]Ibid., p. 11.

[31]Carl F. H. Henry to Gordon H. Clark, March 14, 1957. Folder 12, Box 15, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[32]Gordon H. Clark to Carl F. H. Henry, March 16, 1957. Folder 12, Box 15, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

on the law of noncontradiction.[33] He feared as well that Carnell was becoming shaky on the notion of salvation in Christ alone. Some months later, Henry, in sarcastic tone, wrote Clark again quoting an abstract of an item in Theology News and Notes, a Fuller Alumni newsletter, preceded by the comment, "I thought you might get a chuckle out of an item in Theology News and Notes." The abstract was a high praise for Carnell's Christian Commitment, qualifying it as a work that rates with that of the works of Kant and Aristotle.[34] The neo-orthodox theologian, William Hordern, also found fault with Carnell's book in a review he did in the Christian Century.

Hordern, whom some would have guessed would be more supportive of Carnell, argued that Carnell appeared to misunderstand thinkers such as Kierkegaard and Kant. He felt that Carnell failed to see the problem because he placed too much emphasis on mankind's intuitive sentiments, thereby not taking into account human depravity and consequent potential for error.[35] The rejection he felt from these kinds of criticisms, as well as his sense of failure as president of Fuller Seminary was overwhelming for

---

[33]Apparently, Carnell had moved away from a previously held philosophical position which stated that a thing cannot be A and non A at the same time. Clark was concerned that Carnell was beginning to abandon logic.

[34]Carl F. H. Henry to Gordon H. Clark, November 12, 1957. Folder 7, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[35]Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 184.

Carnell. Christian Commitment was in many ways an example of the tensions which existed in the new evangelicalism, in attempting to make Christianity credible. This attempt for Carnell, however, was not panning out the way he hoped and thought it would. By 1959 Carnell's approach would turn in a more critical direction with the publication of The Case for Orthodox Theology. If fundamentalists had ignored Christian Commitment, "this time he would be heard." Carnell was unconcerned about the negative responses he received from various reviewers of his draft of the book, and remarked once to Ockenga that his new book was going to "separate the men from the boys theologically." It was Carnell's conviction "that the hour to speak has come."[36] For Carnell, fundamentalism began as a movement that sought to preserve "the faith once delivered to the saints." Early in the twentieth century, fundamentalism made a fatal mistake, according to Carnell, in declining from a movement to a mentality. Unlike the reformers, "the fundamentalists failed to connect their convictions with the classical creeds of the Church." The end result was that after the fall of modernism, fundamentalism became a movement without a cause. "Nothing was left but the mentality of fundamentalism, and this mentality is orthodoxy's gravest peril."[37] The fact that historic fundamentalism had become

---

[36]Ibid., p. 188.

[37]Edward John Carnell, The Case for Orthodox Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 113-114.

a mentality was what caused Carnell to conclude that "Fundamentalism is orthodoxy gone cultic." Fundamentalism had become controlled by ideological thinking. This thinking was intolerant, rigid, and dogmatic. "It exempts itself from the limits that original sin places on history; it wages holy wars without acknowledging the elements of pride and personal interest that prompt the call to battle; it creates new evils while trying to correct old ones."[38] Carnell, unlike most new evangelical thinkers, did not esteem Machen as a positive example of the intellectual credibility of early fundamentalism. He argues that Machen thought that the best way the clean up the evangelical Church was to separate from the modernists. Machen, according to Carnell, had disposed of the sins of the modernists, but did not dispose of the sins of those who were thankful they were separatists. Machen and his followers believed that they were delivered from heresy.[39] Carnell notes that Machen's style of separatism was "Status by negation, not precise theological inquiry."[40] Gordon Clark took the occasion to sharply criticize Carnell in a letter to Carl Henry. With regard to Carnell's analysis of Machen, Clark wrote,

> As for Carnell, someone ought to tell him off. He has taken to distorting the facts. He rebukes Machen for

---

[38]Ibid., p. 114.

[39]Ibid., p. 116.

[40]Ibid., p. 117.

> having left the Church. When Carnell was a student, he knew quite well that Machen was tried in ecclesiastical court, denied the elementary justice of presenting his defense, and excommunicated. Machen tried to stay in the church; the church put him out. Now Carnell distorts the facts, and apparently sympathizes with the injustices.[41]

Between this book and a couple of controversial articles he produced for the Christian Century,[42] Carnell achieved his goal of causing the fundamentalists to sit up and take notice. Fundamentalists went on a vehement counter attack, as we shall see in the next chapter. What Carnell may not have expected was the intense criticism that he would receive from the ranks of the new evangelicals. Carnell's friend and colleague Wilbur Smith feared that the "Post-Fundamentalist Faith" article was a betrayal of the cause of Fuller Seminary by encouraging both its liberal and conservative enemies to have reason to celebrate.[43] Andrew W. Blackwood wrote to Carl Henry and said that he felt that Carnell's Case for Orthodox Theology spent "too much time dealing negatively with orthodox people, and not enough time setting forth clearly and kindly what evangelicals stand for today." Regarding Carnell's Christian Century article,

---

[41]Gordon H. Clark to Carl F.H. Henry, October 5, 1959. Folder 12, Box 15, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[42]the two articles were published less than a year apart, see Edward John Carnell, "Post-Fundamentalist Faith," The Christian Century, (August 26, 1959): 971; and Edward John Carnell, "Orthodoxy: Cultic vs. Classical," The Christian Century, (March 30, 1960): 377-399.

[43]Wilbur M. Smith to Carl F. H. Henry, September 21, 1959. Folder 20, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

"Post-Fundamentalist Faith," Blackwood pointed out that the fundamentalists in his center of influence were nowhere near the kind of fundamentalists that Carnell describes. Blackwood also expressed disagreement with the idea that the "younger conservatives," of which Carnell was a part, were solely responsible for the positive condition of orthodox theology. Such an understanding, according to Blackwood, left older conservatives (such as himself) out of the picture.[44] Carl Henry responded to the controversy that Carnell stirred up by remarking to Ockenga that hostility was growing toward Carnell among the dispensationalists as well as some of the Christianity Today editorial staff. Henry relayed the fact that some reviewers were giving the book negative coverage. For example, Philip Hughes regarded The Case for Orthodox Theology as "a bad book" and Bernard Ramm said the book gave "him the impression that the liberals are in the true Church and the fundys outside." Henry also mentioned to Ockenga that Dr. Blackwood resented Carnell's article. The Christian Century article was disappointing to some since Carnell had chosen to use "a liberal organ to scorch fundamentalism, not liberalism." Henry even suggests that Carnell's position is tantamount to "one who soon becomes most at home on an inclusive faculty."

---

[44]Andrew W. Blackwood to Carl F. H. Henry, August 24, 1959. Box 35, Harold John Ockenga Papers (hereafter cited as OP). Archives of the Ockenga Institute, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, Massachusetts (hereafter cited as GC).

Such a condition would be dangerous for Fuller Seminary.[45] The extent of outrage over The Case for Orthodox Theology even reached the British evangelicals whom Henry said "had fought, bled and died to make the term fundamentalism respectable." British evangelicals felt as though their achievements had been thwarted "by Carnell's snubbery of fundamentalism in terms of the American Variety."[46]

This same sentiment was expressed by Harold Ockenga upon publication of Carnell's second article, "Orthodoxy: Cultic vs. Classical." Ockenga told Carnell that he had received several letters of concern regarding his opinions and theological direction. One letter expressed concern that Carnell conceded points to the enemy in his book and his articles. Another letter expressed concern that Carnell was fishing for a position in a liberal school. Another apparent friend accused Carnell of treason for taking his criticisms to the liberals instead of publishing them in more conservative magazines. So penetrating was Carnell's impact that the noted British evangelical, Martin-Lloyd Jones, even regarded Carnell as "lost to the evangelical cause."[47] When one takes a look at the progression of

---

[45]Carl F. H. Henry to Harold John Ockenga, August 27, 1959. Box 35, OP. GC. Carl F. H. Henry to Wilbur M. Smith, September 24, 1959. Folder 20, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[46]Carl F. H. Henry to Bernard Ramm, June 1, 1959; Carl F. H. Henry to Bernard Ramm, January 11, 1960. Folder 12, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

Carnell's thought, Jones's statement comes into sharper focus. The negative response that Carnell receive from many new evangelical sympathizers raises the question as to how unified they were on the ideals of the new evangelicalism in the first place. The new evangelical cause, to which many claimed to be committed, often turned out to be interpreted as the cause of fundamentalism.

This may have been problematic for Carnell because he thought he was taking the new evangelicalism in the direction it ought to go, only to find that his peers were unwilling to let go of what he regarded as fundamentalist baggage. This becomes especially clear in light of the following statement by Ockenga to Carnell.

> We owe our great debt to the fundamentalists for preserving the faith when for fifty years the modernists were in the saddle without any competition philosophically, or practically. Scores of these fundamental leaders have suffered desperately at the hands of the modernist hierarchy in the denominations. They were compelled to form independent schools and many times independent Churches.[48]

Rather than attempt to respond to the letters Ockenga received regarding his apparent move away from orthodoxy, Carnell stated that "it is too soon to tell," and that it would be best to "wait on the verdict of history" to see if he was wrong in his differentiation between cultic and

---

[47]Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, May 6, 1960. Box 35, OP. GC.

[48]Ibid.

classical orthodoxy.[49] The numerous letters that Carnell had written to Ockenga revealed a degree of trust in Ockenga as a friend and colleague. Ockenga was pastoring in Boston while Carnell was holding down the presidency at Fuller. Ockenga would eventually step in as acting president after Carnell's resignation in 1959. The distance between them may have been a point of frustration, especially during times of trouble at Fuller.

The new evangelicals appeared to be apprehensive about going too far with their criticisms of fundamentalism. Fundamentalism was perceived as a negative system of thought, yet the new evangelicals often paid homage to the fundamentalists for maintaining an "orthodox position during a time of persecution and discrimination." The defense of the faith by old guard fundamentalists was the same faith being defended by the new evangelicals. "There may be a difference of attitude but there is no difference in the creedal content of their Christianity."[50] Carnell's disgust with fundamentalism had at times an aroma of almost complete rejection. The Case for Orthodox Theology along with his two Christian Century articles went well beyond most new

---

[49]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, May 14, 1960. Box 35, OP. GC.

[50]Harold John Ockenga to Carl F. H. Henry, November 3, 1959. Folder 7, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA. Apologetically, Ockenga said the older fundamentalists were "driven by controversy and discrimination to various shades of separatism." See Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," p.13.

evangelical criticism of fundamentalism. In 1960, Carnell published The Kingdom of love and the Pride of Life, which proved itself to be more tempered in its analysis of the fundamentalists. In fact, the index has no listing for the topics of fundamentalism or evangelicalism, yet it does cite the topic of separatism on one page. Of separatists Carnell says that their "policies are crudely dictatorial." Furthermore he says that "the way of the separatist is seldom a happy one. Being out of fellowship with both the church universal and the wisdom of the ages, the separatist is prey to novelty and enthusiasm. . . .Rather than trying to heal existing divisions in the church, he is busy creating new ones."[51] Carnell did not have the patience or sympathy with fundamentalism that Ockenga, Henry, and to some extent Ramm displayed. Ramm once pointed out that the fundamentalists have failed to be an effective, challenging force to the mind of modern man. Fundamentalists, Ramm says, "simply Cannot be the voice of orthodoxy in our land." Despite these remarks, Ramm still believed that it was the new evangelical's responsibility to answer them in love and kindness of tone.[52]

---

[51]Edward John Carnell, The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), P. 116.

[52]Bernard Ramm to Carl F. H. Henry, December 4, 1955. Folder 12, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA; In one issue of Eternity magazine, the editors decided to print a number of letters they received with regard to a book review of Ramm's controversial The Christian View of Science and Scripture. The editors apparently commissioned a scholar named Joseph Bayly to review the book. The review was

In the same vein as Ockenga, Henry tipped his hat to the fundamentalists for maintaining a stronger connection to orthodoxy than the liberals,[53] paralleling Ramm's contention that "at least the fundies have a far more right to be called a Church than the liberals and the neos."[54] Ramm's controversial book, The Christian View of Science and Scripture (1954), with its suggestion of theistic evolution, certainly won him few friends in the fundamentalist community, which was an indication that Ramm had moved away from fundamentalism in his view of creation, but his correspondence reveals an affectionate tie. The new evangelical desire to maintain a connection with fundamentalism was even reflected in a series of essays entitled, "Fundamentals of the Faith," which, in the mind of Frank Gaebelein, would "be an outstanding contribution to

---

critical of many of Ramm's conclusions as well as praiseworthy. Most of the letters themselves were critical of Ramm's thesis. Ramm's reply to the review and the letters showed that he did not wish to pursue controversy. " I don't think I will tackle any reply to Joe's review. Admittedly the book is controversial, and I could spend the rest of my life writing answers to reviewers. I don't wish to start any cirle of replies to replies. If the book is defective and opinion concurs at this point, then I should agree to it and mend my mental ways. If it is a solid contribution the book will make its own way. So let's leave it with that." See "Reaction on Ramm: A Flood of Divergent Opinion Continues to Swirl around His Book," Eternity 6 (October 1955): 19-19.

[53]Carl F. H. Henry to Bernard Ramm, December 9, 1955. Folder 12, Box, 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[54]Bernard Ramm to Carl F. H. Henry, May 27, 1959. Folder 12, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

the cause of evangelicalism."[55] The relationship of the new evangelicalism to fundamentalism is somewhat analogous to the relationship between a father and a wayward son (fundamentalists saw the new evangelicals as wayward). The son may have intense dislike (in some cases even hatred) for his father, but it remains an unchangeable relationship nonetheless. The son may also be looking for acceptance by the parent even in the midst of intense rebellion. The theology of the new evangelicals was constructed out of the context of the earlier fights between fundamentalists and modernists. As we have seen, the new evangelicals had a desire to retain the scholarship of the old nineteenth century Princeton model, yet, as Bolich points out, "they did not mold their theology to the mission of the church. It essentially remained a theology for controversy."[56] The number of professional graduate degrees earned by new evangelicals during the 1940s and 1950s, indicated that there would be a significant increase in high level evangelical scholarship. On the contrary, it appears that the focus was once again on the needs of the local church.[57] The intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals was clearly

---

[55]Frank E. Gaebelein to Harold B. Kuhn, October 20, 1964. Folder 2, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[56]Gregory G. Bolich, Karl Barth & Evangelicalism (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1980), p. 45.

[57]Hatch, "Evangelicalism as a Democratic Movement," p. 79.

set from the beginning, having its roots in the founding of Fuller Theological Seminary in 1947.[58] The original goal was to develop an institution where high quality scholarship could evolve. In 1944, Ockenga brought together a group of evangelical theologians for the purpose of discussing the need for academically credible evangelical literature. The evangelical movement was growing, but intellectually it was reliant upon the academic literature of their fundamentalist predecessors.[59] After meeting with the evangelist Charles Fuller to discuss the need for an academically credible institution that was faithful to the authoritative Word of God, it was determined to go ahead with plans to build Fuller Theological Seminary.[60] Ockenga's vision for Fuller Seminary was that it could become the new Princeton "that would recapture the glory and academic standing of the old Princeton."[61] Dan Fuller recalled that his father was

---

[58]Joel A. Carpenter, "From Fundamentalism to the New Evangelical Coalition," in Evangelicalism and Modern America. George Marsden, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), pp.3-16; Daniel P. Fuller, Give the Winds a Mighty Voice: The Story of Charles E. Fuller. (Waco: Word Books, 1972), pp. 193-210; Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 24; Richard Quebedeaux, The Worldly Evangelicals. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978), p. 13; David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), p. 13; Robert Wuthnow, The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 174.

[59]Ockenga describes this development in the forward to Harold Lindsell, The Battle for the Bible (Grand Rapids: Zonervan, 1976).

[60]Ibid.

interested in establishing an institution that was comparable to "Cal Tech." Fuller Seminary was to become the "Cal Tech of the evangelical world."[62] The constituency that supported Charles Fuller's radio ministry were not interested in the work of the seminary, but rather more concerned to supporting a program that was winning souls to Christ. Charles Fuller knew his audience well enough to sense that they were suspicious of seminaries because of all the emphasis on study.[63]

So it is legitimate to ask just how tuned in the evangelical laity was to the vision and goals of the new evangelicals. But Charles Fuller, who knew little about the importance of intellectual credibility, understood enough to go ahead with plans to build the seminary. His own conviction, however, failed to make an impact on his audience, many of whom were staunch fundamentalists. This placed the new evangelical leadership in an elitist position because they were the only ones who really understood the issues and the needs. The populace, whom they were to lead, were more content to hold onto the old ways of fundamentalism, exemplified in the anti-educational response

---

[61]Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 24; Donald Dayton points out that Westminster Theological Seminary has been viewed as an attempt to preserve nineteenth century Princeton theology. See Donald W. Dayton, Discovering an Evangelical Heritage (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988)[1976], p. 137.

[62]Fuller, Give the Winds a Mighty Voice, p. 211.

[63]Ibid., p. 212.

of Charles Fuller's audience as well as in the previously discussed public outcry against Carnell's anti-fundamentalist rhetoric. Exactly why the evangelical populace failed to understand the agenda of the new evangelicalism is not an easy question to answer. In the same way it is difficult to answer the question why evangelicals in today's generation fail to see the necessity of intellectual credibility. The reason, according to Os Guinness, is that the evangelical academic community is at an "intellectual, social and cultural distance from popular evangelicalism." He adds that, "Evangelicalism has developed so great a gap between its `elites' and its `masses' that it appears and acts as socially disjointed."[64] Applying this to the post-World War II generation of evangelicals it is probable that the new evangelical intellectual agenda failed to make an impact on the evangelical community at large. The potential for high level scholarship was present, yet new evangelical scholars typically published more practical works for the sake of the Church at large.

This chapter, for the most part, has focused on the new evangelical perspective of E. J. Carnell, not because his repudiation of fundamentalism is very different from the perspectives of Carl Henry, Harold Ockenga, or Bernard Ramm,

---

[64]Os Guinness, "The American Hour, the Evangelical Moment," Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin 10 (November-December 1986): 24.

but more for the intensity and compelling drive behind his criticisms. New evangelicals like Henry and Ockenga appeared to be less willing to break their ties to fundamentalism, as exemplified in their defense of the preceding generation of fundamentalists. The intensity behind Carnell's repudiation of fundamentalism reflected the necessity he felt for unloading its baggage. For Carnell, fundamentalism no longer meant orthodoxy, but cultic orthodoxy that should be left to its own destruction. From this presupposition, Carnell moved forward with the agenda he felt was necessary for the success of the new evangelicalism. The criticism that Carnell received from his peers marked a unique tension within the movement, a tension that he probably did not expect. Agreeing with Henry's renunciation of fundamentalism in The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism, and Ockenga's 1947 convocation speech regarding the failure of fundamentalism, Carnell may have felt that he was only adding extra punch to the already existing anti-fundamentalist writing of his peers. So the reaction to Carnell's strong repudiation of fundamentalism signaled the beginning stage of new evangelical disunity.[65] Since it can be shown that the new

---

[65]Marsden mentions the division among the Fuller faculty as a result of Carnell's controversial inaugural address in which he argued for tolerance of others who differ theologically, and for academic freedom. Carl Henry, Charles Woodbridge, Wilbur Smith, and Harold Lindsell confronted Carnell and encouraged him to change his mind on the issues raised in his address. Carnell did not back down. See Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 149.

evangelicals were all unified around the necessity of changing the negative impact of fundamentalism on the Church and in the world, it appears that the breaking point was the division between those who were willing to dispense with fundamentalism and those who wished to remain identified with it.

The intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals was in many ways inconsistent with the Charles Fuller's goal to build the "Cal Tech" of evangelicalism. Fuller wanted to see an institution created exclusively for the training of pastors and missionaries, whereas the new evangelicals were interested in tackling a wider range of academic issues than would be necessary for the training of missionaries and pastors. There certainly was an intellectual renewal with the coming of the new evangelical generation, but the question has never thoroughly been answered as to why this renewal never seemed to get past issues surrounding theology. The number of new evangelical theology degrees are numerous as are the number of philosophy degrees (used almost exclusively for apologetics),but where were the musicians, the artists, the historians (besides Church historians), scientists, literary scholars, and the like? Perhaps the most telling example of the conflict of vision within the new evangelical movement is an account of an encounter between Harold Ockenga and Wilbur Smith. Ockenga apparently met Smith in Chicago in 1947 to discuss the possibility of Smith's coming to teach at Fuller. Smith

told Ockenga that he had no formal academic training and that he had no right in such an undertaking. "I have led you wrongly," Smith said, "I do not have a single earned degree." Ockenga's reply was most telling with regards to the conflict of intellectual vision. He commenced to assure Smith that it was all right because what was needed at Fuller was practical teaching from the truths of the Scripture. "The idea is to train young men to be able to preach, to emphasize the great verities of the Word of God, to lead people to Christ. You are best able to be a model to such a new breed of preachers and to inspire them."[66]

If the new evangelicals felt they had resolved the historic tensions that their fathers could not hurdle, why didn't they move on to bigger and better things? The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a vast change from new evangelicalism to a more broadly defined evangelicalism. By the time the 1970s rolled around, it was clear that many of the issues confronted by the new evangelicals, and for that matter the preceding fundamentalist generation, were once again emerging. Two of the most popular were the issues of inerrancy and creationism. Where, then, was the greater intellectual agenda of true integration of faith and learning on all levels? The new evangelical intellectual vision that was articulated by Henry, Ockenga, Ramm and Carnell had gone far off course by the 1960s. The "Cal

---

[66]Quoted in Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 35, footnote 5.

Tech" of evangelicalism became nothing more than another seminary to train pastors and missionaries. The movement that was to unveil to the world great works of evangelical scholarship on all levels found itself instead unveiling in-house polemical treatises on issues of relative non-concern to the greater academic community. The struggles and tensions within the new evangelicalism were reflected the fact that many new evangelicals chose to retain a close identity to fundamentalism in spite of all the rhetoric about its failures and the great need to reform it. Many new evangelicals brought this tension upon themselves because they wanted the best of both worlds: an identity with fundamentalism on the one hand, and a progressive new evangelical agenda on the other. For Carnell, the most appropriate course of action was to sever all ties to fundamentalism since the label carried a negative connotation of separatism. Preserving the fundamentals of the faith was not the issue for Carnell, for he was able to distinguish between the mentality of fundamentalism and the historic doctrines of its foundation.[67]

The new evangelicalism, in spite of its successes, failed to live up to many of the intellectual expectations set forth by its leaders in the late 1940s and 1950s. This was to a large extent due to the lack of unity for the new

---

[67]Carnell, The Case For Orthodox Theology, p. 113; and Edward John Carnell, "Fundamentalism," A Handbook of Christian Theology (New York: World Publishing Company, 1958): 142-143.

evangelical agenda. This lack of unity was most visible in the way that many new evangelicals repudiated the anti-fundamentalist criticisms of Carnell. The already existing criticisms of fundamentalism by Henry, Ockenga, and Ramm may have given the appearance that all would go well once Carnell unveiled his own, but this was not the case. Oddly enough, Carnell was not the first in his generation to draw fundamentalist blood. In fact, Ockenga and Henry were acutely harsh in their criticisms of fundamentalism long before Carnell spoke out on the subject.[68] How then, can we make sense of their scrutiny of Carnell? Perhaps the best way to make sense of this is to look at Carnell as unique because he understood the necessity of letting go of the troubling image of fundamentalism (the mentality of fundamentalism) as the first step toward a workable new evangelicalism.

The internal struggles within the post-World War II generation did not make the new evangelicalism a total failure, but it did result in a divided group that found itself returning to many of the same issues that preoccupied the minds of their fundamentalist predecessors. New

---

[68]Harold John Ockenga, "Can Fundamentalism Win America?" Christian Life and Times 2 (June 1947): 13-15; Joel Carpenter recounts one of Ockenga's diatribes against fundamentalists and their divisive agenda. Fundamentalists, according to Ockenga, were plagued by "an utter incapacity for cooperation." He attacked Carl McIntire for attacking the new evangelicals who refused to join "a new hieraracy of intolerant bigots." see Carpenter, "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism," p. 229. and Henry, The Uneasy Conscience.

evangelical intellectuals were consumed with resolving the intellectual issues that their fundamentalist predecessors failed to resolve. They succeeded insofar as they brought the debate up a couple of notches intellectually, but they ultimately failed to keep themselves from repeating the divisive theological controversies. The new evangelicals would have more to worry about than their own internal inconsistencies. Their repudiation of fundamentalism would bring out weapons from the fundamentalist arsenal that would inflict heavy casualties on the new evangelical agenda.

Chapter Three

The War Against Apostasy: Fundamentalist Opposition to the New Evangelicalism

> The New Evangelicalism is a theological and moral compromise of the deadliest sort. It is an insidious attack upon the word of God. No more subtle menace has confronted the church of Christ since the Protestant Reformation in the days of Luther and Calvin.[1]

The fundamentalists of the 1950s had come quite a distance from the first generation who put together the twelve volume set, The Fundamentals (1910-1915). What many of them failed to understand was that the pre-World War I generation, which included the likes of A. A. Hodges, B. B. Warfield, Francis Patton, and J. Gresham Machen were not separatists of their variety, but in fact highly trained intellectuals who attempted to preserve biblical orthodoxy. The variety of fundamentalists under question in this chapter had little regard for intellectual rigor and were more concerned with maintaining their own notions of biblical purity. This purity manifested itself as second and third order separation. First order separation was first known in 1923, stemming from the practices of the Baptist Bible Union, and in 1932, by the General Association of Regular Baptists. First order separation in the 1920s and 1930s, was the practice of separating from liberal theologians and sinful behavior. Second order separation

---

[1]Charles Woodbridge, The New Evangelicalism (Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1969), p. 7.

became widely known by the 1950s and 1960s as fundamentalists began to react against the rise of the evangelist Billy Graham and the new evangelical movement. The fundamentalists who practiced this form of separatism believed that they were taking a biblically based stand against the apostasy of the new evangelicalism. The new evangelicals, including Graham, were compromising with known liberals who had scorned the truth of the gospel. It was Bob Jones Jr.'s contention that the Bible commands Christians to separate from those who associate with others who practice impure doctrine. Billy Graham, no less, fit this category in the way that he hobnobbed with apostates. Third order separation came into existence during the 1970s, teaching that true Christians should not only separate from non-separatists, like Graham, but also from those who refuse to separate from those who are non-separatists.[2]

The conflicts that arose during the fundamentalist-modernist controversies in the 1920s and 1930s prompted many fundamentalists to think seriously about separatism. The main culprit, in the minds of fundamentalists, was the Federal Council of Churches. The most able foe of the Federal Council was the militant separatist Carl McIntire, who in 1941 became the first president of the opposing American Council of Christian Churches. McIntire argued

---

[2]G. A. Reed, "Separatism," Dictionary of Christianity in America (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1990), pp. 1074-1075.

that the Federal Council had infiltrated evangelical Churches with its diabolical theology that denied the tenets of historic Christianity.[3] Using II Corinthians 6:14-18[4] as the main text to support separatism, McIntire concludes that "God's people cannot support or be a part of a fellowship with unbelievers, such as is represented in the modernist Federal Council."[5] The American Council found itself at odds with the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action, which came into existence in 1942 under the leadership of J. Elwin Wright. Before its founding, however, there was some consideration given to the possibility of the NAE joining arms with the American Council. On October 27, 1942, representatives from both

---

[3]Another militant foe of the Federal Council of Churches was Chester E. Tulga who published the following three booklets in a series entitled, "The Case Against." The Case against the Federal Council of Churches (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1948); The Case Against the World Council of Churches (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1949); The Case Against the National Council of Churches (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951).

[4]"Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? What does a believer have in common with an unbeliever? What agreement is there between the temple of God and idols? For we are the temple of the living God. As God has said: `I will live with them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they will be my people. Therefore come out from among them and be separate, says the Lord. Touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you. I will be a Father to you, and you will be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.' (New International Version).

[5]Carl McIntire, Twentieth Century Reformation (Collingswood: Christian Beacon Press, 1946), p. 193.

groups met at the Moody Bible Institute to discuss the possibility of a coalition. Wright and his colleagues decided that the American Council's agenda was too militant and not in keeping with the positive image that the NAE wanted to project. The meeting ended with a permanent split between the two groups. McIntire recounts that Wright's attitude had changed from general agreement with the American Council's agenda to one of opposition.[6] The stage was now set for bitter struggle between fundamentalists and the emerging group of moderates who were responsible for the founding of the new evangelicalism. The first and foremost concern for fundamentalists was the problem of apostasy, which from biblical texts such as 2 Thessalonians 2:3 means "the falling away." This concern among fundamentalists applied nicely to the new evangelicals who had made clear their willingness to dialogue with modernists.

During the 1940s, prominent fundamentalists like Bob Jones Sr., and John R. Rice were connected to the National Association of Evangelicals.[7] The outspoken desire for cooperative efforts by the NAE leadership would eventually drive remaining fundamentalists to the separatist camps. Compromise was something that the separatists could not

---

[6]Ibid., p. 199.

[7]George M. Marsden, "The State of Evangelical Christian Scholarship," Christian Scholar's Review 17 (June 1988): 347-360; David O. Beale, In Pursuit of Purity: American Fundamentalism Since 1850 (Greenville: Unusual Publications, 1986), p. 258.

handle, nor did they want to be associated with those who practiced it.[8] A number of fundamentalist leaders expressed their contempt for the new evangelical agenda. The intense criticisms that were levelled against the new evangelicals bore a striking resemblance to the kinds of criticisms that earlier fundamentalists charged to the modernists in major denominations. Many second generation fundamentalists of the 1940s and 1950s did not go so far as to accuse the new evangelicals of being unsaved or of being modernists themselves, whereas first generation fundamentalists were not so generous in their descriptions of modernists. They, for all practical purposes, were children of the devil, bent on apostasy.[9]

As was previously mentioned, Carl McIntire's American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC) had separated from the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) because the NAE, according to McIntire, was a group of moderate Compromisers.[10] After the break, which established a

---

[8]Separatists often refer to separation from "worldliness," which usually involved tobacco, alcoholic beverages, card playing, movie theater attendance, petting, dancing, and associating with unsaved companions. See Robert L. Sumner, Separation From Sin and Worldliness (Wheaton: Sword of the Lord, 1955); and Ernest Pickering, Biblical Separation: The Struggle For a Pure Church (Schaumburg: Regular Baptist Press, 1979), pp. 127-139. Strict separatists even raised the question of whether such amusements as bowling, chess and monopoly are acceptable for Christians. See John R. Rice, Amusements for Christians: Right or Wromg? (Wheaton: Sword of the Lord, 1955), pp. 3-48.

[9]T. J. McCrossan, The Bible: Its Christ and Modernism (Wheaton: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1929), pp. 62-77.

permanent division between separatist fundamentalists and the new evangelicals, McIntire began to devote much time and energy to the denunciation of both the NAE and the new evangelicalism. Most of McIntire's attacks were printed in his fundamentalist periodical, the Christian Beacon. It was McIntire's goal to sound forth a new reformation to clean the Church of its apostasy. He criticized the NAE for joining hands with apostates while at the same time claiming to embrace the fundamentals of the historic Christian faith.[11] The gospel, once delivered, could not be compromised.

The new evangelicals expressed some desire for unity with fundamentalists. Carl Henry, for example, attempted to show his support for unity in his Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism (1947). This work, though critical of fundamentalism, was also meant to help reconcile the broken relationship between evangelicals and fundamentalists. Regarding the need for a unified voice, Henry says, "The

---

[10]McIntire, Twentieth Century Reformation, pp. 198-205; It should be noted that it appears that McIntire was hurt deeply by the rejection of his plan for the unification of the NAE and the ACCC by the NAE organizers. This is evidenced clearly in numerous anti-NAE articles and editorials in his Christian Beacon in which he continually recounts the events surrounding the split between the two groups. See "We Told You So," Christian Beacon 27 (May 10, 1962): 1, 8; and "Not Mud, Not a Shovel--But the Truth," Christian Beacon 28 (September 19, 1963): 4-5.

[11]"The Worst Sin Today," Christian Beacon 21 (January 17, 1957): 4, 8; and Chester E. Tulga, The Doctrine of Separation in These Times (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1952), pp. 3-64.

force of the redemptive message will not break with apostolic power upon the modern scene unless the American Council of Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals meet at some modern Antioch, and Peter and Paul are face to face in a spirit of mutual love and compassion."[12] But the call for unity by the new evangelicals ultimately led nowhere. As long as separatists like McIntire resisted the agenda of the new evangelicals, it would be impossible for unity of any kind to come about.[13]

The primary example of new evangelical compromise, according to fundamentalists, was "Ecumenical Evangelism."[14] Billy Graham was the most visible target for fundamentalists

---

[12]Carl F. H. Henry, The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism, p. 81; Henry later called for even more unity among evangelicals stating, "I think the time has come for evangelicals to lower the fences that divide them--fences between the American Council of Christian Churches and the National Association of Evangelicals and evangelicals in the National Council of Churches. . . .Some friends of mine in the divergent groupings have already warned that any such plea will be stillborn. But I dare to believe that some evangelicals long to see God do a new thing. Our divisions have now become a scandal, and they are a barrier to effective fulfillment of the Great Commission. If you do not think so, produce the evidence of success." See Carl F. H. Henry, "Demythologizing the Evangelicals," Christianity Today 12 (September 13, 1968): 13-15.

[13]Mark Silk, "The Rise of the `New Evangelicalism': Shock and Adjustment," in William R. Hutchison, ed., Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 278-299.

[14]Chester E. Tulga, The Case Against Modernism in Evangelism (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1952), pp. 9-60.

in this war. In response to an article that Edward Carnell wrote for Christianity Today[15] regarding the question of whether or not Graham would be able to win the city of New York for Christ, McIntire countered with the observation that Graham would in no way slay the giant, as Carnell says, but instead join arms with him. Graham's association with known apostates rendered obsolete the notion that he was a defender of Christian orthodoxy.[16] McIntire took the occasion to criticize Graham on his 1961 Philadelphia evangelistic campaign as well. He acknowledged that there was a time when Graham received full support and blessing from fundamentalists. All of this changed, however, when he began to cater to the whims of apostates and modernists. Fundamentalist leaders like Bob Jones and John R. Rice were no longer able in good conscience to support what they considered to be ecumenical evangelism.[17]

---

[15]Edward John Carnell, "Can Billy Graham Slay the Giant?" Christianity Today (May 13, 1957): 3-5.

[16]"Goliath and Graham," Christian Beacon 22 (May 30, 1957): 1,8; McIntire also pointed out in this article the way that Carnell shamefully cited the Revised Standard Version for his scriptural references. It has been suggested that Graham's cooperative efforts in the New York crusade resulted in a "definitive split" between fundamentalists and new evangelicals. See George M. Marsden, "Unity and Diversity in the Evangelical Resurgence," in David W. Lotz, ed., Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America, 1935-1985 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), p. 69.

[17]Bob Jones University even made it known through advertizing that they were opposed to the new evangelicalism. In one magazine advertizement they state, "Today when so much is being said about the `new evangelicalism' Bob Jones University still stands for the `Old Evangelicalism' - For the evangelicalism that is

In no time at all, separatist fundamentalists began to identify Graham as a major leader in the ecumenical movement.[18] Furthermore, how could any committed Christian respect a man who allows on his platform known blasphemers such as Bishop James E. Pike? How could any committed Christians sanction Graham's use of the Revised Standard Version? As a result, McIntire concluded that Graham not only was a major figure in the ecumenical movement, but also in the building of a one world Church.[19] Graham supporters, on the other hand, let it be known that they were enthusiastic about his efforts "And that throughout the Philadelphia area are grateful hearts, lifted in praise to God for the ministry of His servant."[20] McIntire's approach was not entirely focused on informing his constituency about Graham's compromising activities. He even wrote to Graham to plead with him to take a biblical stand on separation from unbelievers. The letter addressed March 15, 1962, confronted Graham about being photographed with the Archbishop of Canterbury whom McIntire believed to be one of the most blatant modernist unbelievers of the day. After a

---

scriptural." Moody Monthly 59 (March 1959), inside cover.

[18]Carl McIntire, "Ecumenical Evangelism," Christian Beacon 26 (July 13, 1961): 2-3,8; James Alexander Stewart, "The Evangelicals and the World Ecumenical Movement," Part I, Voice 44 (November 1965): 8-9, and Part II, Voice 44 (December 1965): 7-9.

[19]Ibid., p. 8.

[20]"In Appreciation of Graham's Crusade," Eternity (November 1961): 8.

lengthy exhortation to acknowledge the error of his ways, McIntire called on Graham to immediately repudiate the World Council of Churches.[21]

Graham's research associate, Robert O. Ferm, articulated a clear polemic in favor of Graham in his book, Cooperative Evangelism: Is Billy Graham Right or Wrong? (1958), quoting from a letter written by Kenneth de Courcy, editor of the London based magazine, The Intelligence Digest, to McIntire. He pointed out to McIntire that fundamentalist criticism of Graham was based in large part on jealousy. Those who criticize Graham do it openly "which only causes the world to laugh and ridicule at the further divisions among the Lord's people."[22] Graham's response was to remain silent against his critics. Instead, it was his conviction that he would preach the gospel to anyone, anywhere, at anytime, as long as he could preach "the doctrines of historic Christianity."[23] McIntire devoted most

---

[21]"McIntire Pleads with Graham to Take Scriptural Stand of Separation From Unbelievers," Christian Beacon 27 (March 29, 1962): 5, 8; McIntire was even confident enough to say that Jesus himself was a "Kind of separatist fundamentalist." in Erling Jorstad, "Two on the Right: A Comparative Look at Fundamentalism and New Evangelicalism," Lutheran Quarterly 23 (May 1971): 107-117.

[22]Robert O. Ferm, Cooperative Evangelism: Is Billy Graham Right or Wrong? (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958), p. 89.

[23]William G. McLaughlin Jr., Billy Graham: Revivalist in a Secular Age (New York: Ronald Press, 1960), pp. 227-228; Billy Graham, "Fellowship and Separation," Eternity 19 (January 1968): 14-16; Graham was also known to answer other critics, besides fundamentalists, who questioned such things as his over emphasis on social issues, his

of his attention to criticizing the NAE as a whole and key figures like Graham as sideline targets. The cooperative efforts on behalf of the NAE were identified by McIntire as a "Middle-of-the-Road" position. The NAE desired to stand outside of the modernist camp in commitment to the historic fundamentals of the Christian faith. In essence, they neither wanted to be associated with modernism, nor did they want to be associated with separatistic fundamentalism. Their desire was to remain between the two extremes and make every effort to infiltrate the camps of the modernists in order to win them over. What troubled McIntire was that the NAE consistently failed to condemn the Federal Council of Churches, and even tolerated some of its own leader's defense of it.[24]

In comparing the NAE with the ACCC, McIntire describes it as a group of Middle-of-the-Roaders with little focus and commitment. Members of the NAE "get together for a meeting, but it is difficult to bring the same individuals back together again." The ACCC, on the other hand, are committed and active with over eighty three member denominations that

---

organization's finances, and follow-up to those converted at his crusades. See Billy Graham, "In Answer to My Critics," Eternity 12 (September 1961): 16-19, 40; and Billy Graham, "Fellowship and Separation," Decision (August 1961): 1, 14-15.

[24]"Consistent Middle-of-the-Roaders," Christian Beacon 26 (February 1962): 4.

make up the International Council of Christian Churches.[25] Other new evangelicals fell prey to the scrutiny of McIntire, including one of the most controversial of them all, Edward John Carnell. Carnell was one of the few new evangelicals to receive severe criticism from both the fundamentalists and, as we have already seen, from his new evangelical peers. After Carnell took part in a panel to question the theologian Karl Barth at the University of Chicago, he made the claim that he was forever changed by the experience. McIntire referred to Carnell as "a man without foundations." To the dismay of McIntire, Carnell said that "whatever Barth may lack in the way of doctrinal consistency he compensates for by his Christian graciousness." McIntire was confounded that Carnell had written that watching Barth walk down the isle of an

---

[25]"The Road Back," Christian Beacon 27 (November 1962): 1, 8; "Down the Middle," Christian Beacon 28 (May 9, 1963): 1, 8. By way of comparison it's interesting to note that in 1960 the number of ACCC affiliate Church appears to be much lower than the affiliate number of eighty-three given by McIntire in 1963. It should be noted that the 1960 statistics were reprinted in 1965. See J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., "The American and International Councils of Christian Churches," Christianity Today 9 (January 29, 1965): 9-11; Carl Henry made the charge that "The American Council professes to speak for many more members than McIntire has ever been able to confirm to the press, and the ACCC leaders have learned to exploit the mass media far out of proportion to the movement's numbers." Carl F. H. Henry, Evangelicals at the Brink of Crisis (Waco: Word Books, 1967), p. 105; The embellishments of numbers of members went from 250,000 to 8 million. The 8 million member number was apparently in an article in Newsweek (Dec 2. 1968), reflecting "the gross distortions for which McIntire has often been cited." See Robert T. Coote, "Carl McIntire's Troubled Trail," Eternity 20 (May 1969): 28-29, 34-38.

auditorium was a religious experience. McIntire reasoned that Barth was a liberal "who has done so much to ruin the faith of men in the infallibility of the scriptures, the inerrancy of the scriptures."[26] McIntire went so far as to say that Carnell could no longer be referred to as an evangelical. In the same breath, Fuller Seminary was targeted as a former Bible believing institution that has upset the Bible believing faith of many good men rather than encouraging and strengthening them in the inerrant Word of God.[27]

Many fundamentalists despised the mediating position of the new evangelicals for its elusiveness and noncommittal attitude toward modernism. The militant separatist, and founder of the General Association of Regular Baptists, Robert T. Ketchum, referred to new evangelical middle-of-the-roaders as being more difficult to confront than the modernists. Modernists at least know and admit where they stand, whereas the new evangelicals commit to nothing in particular with the exception of ecclesiastical unity. This kind of unity, Ketchum says, is centered around the desire for "peaceful coexistence." Harold John Ockenga, was accused by Ketchum of placing peaceful coexistence above doctrinal purity. This kind of peaceful coexistence was similar to the peaceful coexistence of which liberals and

---

[26]"A Man Without Foundations," Christian Beacon 27 (June 14, 1962): 1, 8.

[27]Ibid., p. 8.

communists spoke. But Ketchum was very careful to say that he was not accusing the new evangelicals of being communists.[28] He accused the new evangelicals of drawing first blood in the war with fundamentalism. Ketchum identified the militant conflict with the new evangelicals saying, "We're not playing tiddlywinks any more, we're in a shooting war from here on out!"[29] It was precisely this kind of family feuding that ultimately kept the new evangelical agenda from developing into an intellectually respectable movement. Instead, all their energies were focused on resolving the theological disputes of their fundamentalist predecessors, as well as keeping their heads down in the shooting war itself. The basis for a great deal of the fundamentalist criticism of the new evangelicals was an article in Christian Life entitled, "Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" The article was based upon a questionnaire that was sent out to a number of evangelical Christian leaders in the United States. Included in the list were prominent new evangelicals such as Vernon Grounds, Carl Henry, E. J. Carnell, Kenneth Kantzer, Harold Kuhn, Bernard Ramm, and Cornelius Van Til.[30] The article

---

[28]Robert T. Ketchum, "Present Day Trends," a taped message given at a General Association of Regular Baptist conference, 1961. Tape Archives, William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

[29]Ibid.

[30]"Is Evangelical Theology Changing?" Christian Life (March 1956): 16-19.

reflected the conviction among those surveyed that evangelical theology was changing from an ineffective fundamentalist orthodoxy to a more relevant new evangelical theology.[31] Ketchum critiqued the article by drawing an analogy between jazz music, which he argued is a shift in emphasis in the beat, and the new evangelicalism which has shifted its emphasis theologically.[32] The new evangelicals march to their own beat, according to Ketchum, and have attempted to shift the emphasis away from doctrinal purity to peaceful coexistence. Ketchum scolded his long time friend, "Charlie Fuller," along with Harold Ockenga for allowing this shift in emphasis to continue. With Bible in hand before a captive audience Ketchum thundered, "If every born again believer who believes this book, and Ockenga does believe it so far as I know. How long before he becomes a modernist, if he doesn't watch his company, Is a guarantee.[sic]"[33] Alva J. McClain, President of Grace Theological Seminary, reacted to the Christian Life article by accusing it of being weak journalism because it only gave brief snippets of comments taken out of context, which did not allow the reader to understand the statements in proper context. Furthermore, it seemed as though the editors of the magazine were "allergic" to the use of the term

---

[31]Ibid.

[32]Robert T. Ketchum, "Present Day Trends."

[33]Ibid; and Louis Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1963]), pp. 119-120.

fundamentalist. McClain was troubled that Billy Graham was cited as being opposed to the term fundamentalist. Graham, says McClain, "would have been better advised (if he was advised) to have accepted it and then to have defined carefully its true and historical meaning." Accepting the title "fundamentalist" would in no way have endangered Graham's stature, but rather it "would have saved from distress and perplexity thousands of his devoted supporters who have (rightly or wrongly) identified the cause of evangelical Christianity with the fundamentalist movement."[34] McClain's assessment appears to put the cart before the horse insofar as it makes the term evangelical subordinate to the term fundamentalist, a term that had only a recent past. McClain's argument against the new evangelicalism is that in its desire to dialogue with liberals it appears to be afraid of being opposed to things that are wrong. "Hobnobbing too closely to the enemy," McClains says, "has always cost the cause of Christianity much more than it ever gained."[35]

The voice of fundamentalist discontent with the new evangelicals could be heard from other fundamentalist journals as well. The Sword of the Lord, published by the militant crusader, John R. Rice, featured a lengthy polemic

---

[34]Alva J. McClain, "Is Theology Changing in the Conservative Camp?" Brethren Missionary Herald (February 23, 1957): 123-124.

[35]Ibid., p. 124.

by Dr. Richard V. Clearwaters against the new evangelicals. The article opens with a defense of fundamentalism as a movement that has provided the basis for the old evangelicalism. The old evangelicalism is based on the Word of God, but the new evangelicalism is based on human experience at the expense of doctrine. The new evangelicalism is a movement that has shied away from the term "fundamentalism." Furthermore, the new evangelicals "like to worship at the shrine of science, which is `ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth' and yet the scientists in many instances disregard and even mock the Bible as a divine and exclusive revelation."[36] Clearwaters perceived the new evangelicals to be mere reactionaries to fundamentalism "and are aiding and abetting a bad cause." Modernism, he says, is winning the battle and the new evangelical theology is really nothing more than the old modernism in different clothes. In essence, it is a "new liberal evangelical theology."[37] The problem Clearwaters had with the likes of new evangelicals such as Bernard Ramm and Vernon Grounds was that they confuse the great creeds of the Church and Reformation Protestantism with the evangelical faith of the New Testament. It is the Bible that justifies and defines

---

[36]Richard V. Clearwaters, "The Bible; The Unchanging Evangelical Volume (Intended as an answer to the Christian Life article, March, 1956)" Sword of the Lord 22 (May 4, 1956): 1-2,5,6,7.

[37]Ibid.

evangelicalism, not tradition. Fundamentalist critics generally agreed that the new evangelicals were guilty of having an overly friendly view of science; tolerance toward diverse views on eschatology; hostility toward dispensationalism; intellectual arrogance; being overly concerned with social agendas; wavering on the question of biblical inspiration; and being willing to dialogue with liberals. These were the observations, of course, that Clearwaters gleaned from the Christian Life article.[38] On another occasion, Clearwaters concluded that the new evangelicalism had created a double divisiveness in the evangelical tradition. The new evangelicalism was responsible for dividing fundamentalists into two different groups: "Fundamentalists and conservatives," and dividing modernists into two different groups: "Modernists and liberals."[39] The New evangelicalism was "A movement born of Compromise, a movement nurtured on pride of intellect, and a movement growing on appeasement of evil."[40]

Much of this scrutiny was in reaction to various new evangelical criticisms of fundamentalism. Vernon Grounds once sarcastically quipped that "Fundamentalism is too much

---

[38]Ibid.

[39]Richard V. Clearwaters, "The Double Divisiveness of the New Evangelicalism," Central C. B. Quarterly 1 (Summer 1958): 1-6.

[40]Ibid.

fun, too much damn, and too little mental!"[41] In response, Clearwaters reminded Sword of the Lord readers that Grounds was in many ways a traitor to the cause of fundamentalism, one who used to be associated with the American Council of Christian Churches, as well as the General Association of Regular Baptists, but had now turned his face toward the new evangelicals. In addition, Grounds was seen as standing in sympathy with those who were once his enemies, and "hurling his cudgel at enemies of liberalism who were once his friends." From the teaching podium of the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary, Grounds defended the new evangelicalism with eager vitality. He was concerned about defending himself and the seminary against the fundamentalists. While certainly a defender of the ideals of the new evangelicalism, he said that he was only acquainted superficially with the leaders of the movement.[42] The new evangelicals were not learning what fundamentalists learned from battling with modernists long ago, namely, that compromise with apostasy is not an option. New evangelicals have arrived at the half way point between fundamentalism and liberalism through the process of "gradualism." This kind of gradualism led one prominent fundamentalist to conclude that the new evangelicalism is nothing more than

---

[41]Quoted in Clearwaters, "The Bible: The Unchanging Evangelical Volume," p. 6.

[42]Vernon Grounds, "Old-Fashioned Faith and Neo-Fundamentalism." An unpublished paper from the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary. Official Date unknown.

the "new neutralism."[43]

It is difficult to place the blame for this war of words on any one person or group within the fundamentalist and new evangelical camps, yet it is clear that shots were fired from both directions. Grounds, Henry, Ockenga, and Ramm certainly did not believe that they were going to make fundamentalists rejoice at what they were publishing. In the case of Carnell, however, it is apparent that he wanted to get their dander up. As we have seen, he accomplished this through two controversial articles in the Christian Century and his book, The Case For Orthodox Theology.[44] The more that the new evangelicals took shots at the fundamentalists, and visa versa, the more bogged down the two groups became in a war of words that ultimately took the new evangelicals in a direction they never really wanted to go. Rather than releasing to the world great works of new evangelical scholarship, along with a proactive social agenda, the new evangelicals were instead initiating a war with fundamentalists, reminiscent of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy.

Neutrality was something that the new evangelicals

---

[43]William A. Ashbrook, Evangelicalism: The New Neutralism (Columbus: Calvary Bible Church, 1970); Ashbrook, "Evangelicalism: The New Neutralism," Central C. B. Quarterly 2 (Summer 1959): 31-32.

[44]Edward John Carnell, The Case for Orthodox Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959); "Post-Fundamentalist Faith," Christian Century (August 26, 1959): 971; "Orthodoxy: Cultic vs. Classical," Christian Century (March 30, 1960): 377-399.

hoped would allow them to work with both sides of the theological fence. Infiltration into the liberal camp was part of the new evangelical plan. But, infiltration would be impossible were they to align themselves with the separatists. But neutrality had its down side in the minds of many fundamentalists for it rendered aid to the enemy rather than allowing them the opportunity to infiltrate.[45] This placed the new evangelicals on the outside of fundamentalism, where they seemed to be at home, yet C. Stacey Woods argued that the new evangelicals ought to rejoin the fundamentalists thus observing that "we are the children of the original fundamentalists and we should stand together and make common cause in the defense of the historic gospel."[46] The new evangelicalism, Woods points out, is nothing more than an emasculated faith with little doctrinal conviction.[47]

The critics of the new evangelicalism were not always from within the militant separatist camps of McIntire, Jones, or Rice, but also among those of a more moderate persuasion. With moderates, the issue of ecclesiastical separation was not the main problem, but more often than not

---

[45]Robert Lightner, "The New Evangelicals---Bystanders of the Faith," Discerner 6 (July-September, 1969): 4-10; and Charles Woodbridge, Campus Crusade Examined in the Light of Scripture (Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1970), pp. 5-23.

[46]C. Stacey Woods, "Why I'm a Fundamentalist and not a Neutral Protestant," Voice 42 (October 1963): 9.

[47]Ibid.

it was the lack of attention the new evangelicals gave to the Church itself. Edward J. Young, for instance, was concerned that the new evangelicals wanted to build the Church with very little reference to it. He acknowledged, along with the more militant fundamentalists, that they are not discreet enough about who they associate with at evangelistic meetings. The new evangelicals place considerable emphasis upon the intellect and education and "stresses just about everything except the all-important doctrine of the church, and the need for vigorous contending for the faith." Rhetorically Young asks, "Is then the new evangelicalism the answer to the present-day situation?" To which he answers with an emphatic No, coupled with the conclusion that if he had to choose between the new evangelicalism and fundamentalism, he would choose fundamentalism.[48] Dallas Theological Seminary President, John F. Walvoord, a moderate who was able to stay clear of much of the conflict between the fundamentalists and the new evangelicals, attempted to persuade the new evangelical community to reconsider returning to the descriptive term of fundamentalism. He expressed the concern that "Old-fashioned fundamentalism seems to be disappearing." This disappearance, he wrote, can be found in Christian periodicals as well as in the comments of religious figures

---

[48]Quoted in John W. Sanderson, Jr., "Neo-Evangelicalism and its Critics," Sunday School Times 103 (January 28, 1961): 66, 74, 82.

like Billy Graham and Vernon Grounds.[49] Walvoord's plea to return to the term fundamentalism reflected his desire to maintain an attachment to the historic fundamentals of the faith. Evangelicals must resist the temptation to criticize fundamentalism since so many find it the fashionable thing to do. Walvoord admitted that evangelicals may very well need a new descriptive term, but until that day, "let us not dodge our sacred responsibility to stand squarely on the fundamentals of Christian faith revealed in the infallible Word of God."[50]

One if the most interesting moderates was the anti-communist crusader, Billy James Hargis. Hargis was unapologetically a fundamentalist and the founder of the "Christian Crusade" ministry and the Christian Crusade magazine. In 1961, an apparent rift between the staff of Christianity Today and Hargis resulted from what Hargis argued was the publishing of libelous material against him in Christianity Today. To make things even worse, the Houston Chronicle reprinted a portion from the CT article which read, "We have no sympathy with wild generalizations whether made by McIntires, Hargises or others." This outraged Hargis who promptly demanded a printed apology from both the editors of Christianity Today and the Houston

---

[49]John F. Walvoord, "What's Right About Fundamentalism?" Eternity 8 (June 1957): 6-7, 34-35.

[50]Ibid., p. 35.

Chronicle.[51] But Hargis proved himself to be a moderate fundamentalist in his statement of support to L. Nelson Bell for Billy Graham.

> I have never, in writing or otherwise, opposed Billy Graham. Billy has won many souls to Christ. I thank God for any man who wins souls for Christ. Neither have I criticized you or Christianity Today.[52]

This was a stunning confession from a fundamentalist who had on his advisory board militant separatists such as Bob Jones Jr. and Bob Jones Sr.[53] Whether or not other fundamentalists, including Bob Jones Jr. and Sr., knew about his accepting position on Graham and Christianity Today is not certain. What is certain, however, is that by 1968, tensions between Hargis and the Christianity Today staff drove the relationship more closely to complete separatism.[54] Christianity Today asked General William K. Harrison to review a book that was written by John H. Redekop entitled, The American Far Right: A Case Study of Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade (1968). Harrison

---

[51]Billy James Hargis to J. P. Clements, June 27, 1961. Billy James Hargis to L. Nelson Bell, July 12, 1961. Folder 64, Box 17, Collection 8, CT Records. GA;

[52]Billy James Hargis to L. Nelson Bell, July 12, 1961. Folder 64, Box 17, Collection 8, CT Records. GA. Bell was executive editor of Christianity Today from 1956 to 1973, and Billy Graham's father-in-law.

[53]This is a list of members who served on Hargis' advisory board in 1961. Folder 30, Box 1, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[54]Hargis, who was once supportive of Billy Graham, spoke out against him on his radio program on April 12, 1966. He attacked Graham for not separating from apostasy. See Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday, footnote 25, p. 73.

concluded that Hargis was in many ways as dangerous to the United States as the communists. Hargis reacted violently, once again accusing Christianity Today of publishing libelous material against him and the Christian Crusade ministry. The CT editors attempted to reason with Hargis that this was a book review and not an editorial or article. Book reviews should be taken up with the reviewer, not the publisher. Hargis did not agree with this interpretation, however, and a bitter war of words began to flow between the two groups, resulting in a final break between Hargis and Christianity Today.[55]

The desire to maintain the unity of believers became an all-encompassing debate in the fundamentalist and new evangelical camps.[56] This debate was motivated out of the

---

[55]L. Nelson Bell to Billy James Hargis, August 28, 1968; Harold Lindsell to Billy James Hargis, September 24, 1968; Billy James Hargis to Harold Lindsell, October 3, 1968; Harold Lindsell to Billy James Hargis, October 8, 1968; Harold Lindsell to Rev. Francis R. Hill, October 16, 1968. Folder 64, Box 17, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[56]The new evangelicals called for the unity of believers centered around the desire to attain the mind of Christ in obedience to the Word of God. "A Plea For Evangelical Unity," Christianity Today (March 13, 1961): 24-25; Elton M. Eenigenburg, "Separatism is Not Scriptural," Eternity 14 (August 1963): 16, 18-22; Unity among the new evangelicals was important, but not at the expense of tolerating unholy behavior. See Vernon Grounds, "Separatism Yes, Schism No," Eternity 14 (August 1963): 17-22; The new evangelicals believed that they should be on guard against unsound doctrine, but the question of separating from other believers due to doctrinal impurity cannot be supported by the New Testament. See George Eldon Ladd, "The Evangelical's Dilemma: Doctrinal Purity vs. Visible Unity," Eternity 13 (June 1963): 7-9, 33; and Stephen W. Paine, "Separation" is Separating Evangelicals (Boston: Fellowship Press, 1951), pp. 3-43.

concern to remain committed to the health of the local and collective Church at large, substantiating the position of Edward J. Young. Unity among believers did not seem hopeful in the minds of fundamentalists, only unity among "true" believers. For McIntire, unity was only possible if it involved member churches in the ACCC or at least those churches that agreed with the position of the ACCC. Any other kind of unity would involve unity with ecumenical apostates of the World Council of Churches.[57] This sharp disagreement between the new evangelicals and the fundamentalists on the question of the unity of believers helped to widen the gap between them even more. The new evangelicals were willing to make certain concessions in order to attain unity while staunch fundamentalists refused to even give the matter any serious thought. The hope for any kind of unity between the forces of fundamentalism and new evangelicalism had been fading away fast since the 1942 break between the ACCC and the NAE. By 1957, however, the division between the two groups was at an irresolvable breach[58] thus leaving room only for the two groups to sell their agendas to their constituencies, or, in the case of

---

[57]Carl McIntire, "Biblical Christian Unity," Christian Beacon 27 (April 26, 1962): 1,8; and Chester E. Tulga, The Doctrine of the Church in These Times (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1953), pp. 7-61.

[58]Butler Farley Porter, Jr., "Billy Graham and the End of Evangelical Unity" (Ph.D dissertation, University of Florida, 1976); George W. Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Sarasota: Daniels Publishing, 1983 [1973]), p. 204.

the fundamentalists, to win conservative evangelicals over to the fundamentalist side.[59]

The new evangelicals, although more apt to criticize fundamentalists on an academic level, did not appear to go after their fundamentalist critics with the same kind of ferocity with which they were being fought.[60] Carnell, as we have shown, certainly went after the fundamentalists with guns blazing, yet with the exception of his two Christian Century articles, never in the kind of popular tabloid manner as exemplified by Carl McIntire or John R. Rice. Carl Henry, though critical of the fundamentalist withdrawal from social responsibility, made the attempt to reconcile the differences between fundamentalists and new evangelicals in some of his editorials in Christianity Today.[61] He did, on one occasion, blast McIntire and the ACCC for what he referred to as "Yellow Journalism" against the new evangelical movement, with his Christian Beacon as "a religious smear sheet in the worst tradition."[62] As was

---

[59]Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday, p. 44; Ockenga and McIntire were once close friends, but by 1947 were competing against each other in a battle over fundamentalist leadership. See Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 28.

[60]This point has proven to be generally true, yet, on one occasion McIntire's entire ministry was brought under intense scrutiny. McIntire was exposed as a manipulator and power monger who was ultimately responsible for a number of scandelous rifts within his own ministry. see Coote, "Carl McIntire's Troubled Trail," pp. 28-29, 34-38.

[61]Henry, "Demythologizing the Evangelicals."

[62]CT editorial quoted in Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday, p. 44;

shown in the previous chapter, Harold John Ockenga along with Henry, often spoke sympathetically of their ties to the fundamentalist tradition with an occasional reference to their desire to be counted as one of them. As supportive as Wilbur Smith was for the new evangelicalism, even he lamented the fact that the days are long gone when evangelicalism had a faithfulness to the Word of God like "the now defunct World Christian Fundamentals Association."[63]

Despite these occasional attempts at good charity on behalf of the new evangelicals toward the fundamentalists and fundamentalism, it was apparent that too much damage and division had been done for any realistic reunion between these two bitter rivals. While the new evangelicals have admitted that by the late 1960s the so-called new evangelicalism had been swallowed up by a more broadly defined evangelicalism,[64] fundamentalists continued to make reference to "new evangelicals" and "new evangelicalism" well into the 1980s.[65] The essence of the new evangelical

---

[63]Wilbur M. Smith to Carl F. H. Henry, April 4, 1961. Folder 20, Box 10, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[64]Ockenga, "From Fundamentalism, Through New Evangelicalism, to Evangelicalism," pp. 35-46.

[65] See H. F. MacEwen, "New Evangelicalism," Reformation Review 21 (April 1974): 120-141; Rolland D. McCune, "An Analysis of the New Evangelicalism: History," Central Bible Quarterly 19 (Spring 1976): 2-17; Carlton Helgerson, "The Challenge of a New Religion: Neo-Evangelicalism," Part I, Central Bible Quarterly 21 (Spring 1978): 3-17, Part II, Central Bible Quarterly 21 (Summer 1978): 9-19; Dell G. Johnson, "W. B. Riley and the Developing New

agenda was intimately tied to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy that had been fought by their fundamentalist predecessors. It is from this frame of reference that the new evangelicalism must be understood.[66] The new evangelicals were eager to bring to evangelicalism a proactive social agenda and intellectually respectable scholarship, yet once immersed in battle with the fundamentalists, dreams for such a reality gave way to what is tantamount to a survival mode, not just for the new

---

Evangelicalism," Central Bible Quarterly 21 (Fall 1978): 2-28; James T. Shaw, "Neo-Evangelicalism," Reformation Review 24 (April 1979): 96-104; Morris McDonald, "Contemporary Trends in New Evangelicalism," Reformation Review 25 (January 1980): 17-45; Wilson D. Kirkwood, "The New Evangelicals and the Biblical Doctrine of Separation: Book Review," Reformation Review 26 (April 1981): 105-114; and Curtis Hutson, New Evangelicalism: An Enemy of Fundamentalism (Murfeesboro: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1984), pp. 3-38

[66]Douglas A. Sweeney, "Fundamentalism and the Neo-Evangelicals," Fides et Historia 14 (Winter/Spring 1992): 81-96. Sweeney's analysis, although perceptive, fails to go far enough in its conclusion that the "new evangelicalism will not be perceived accurately until historians begin to reckon with the enduring effects of the fundamentalist-modernist controversies on the evangelical tradition." The enduring effects, as this study is attempting to show, were best seen in the intense warfare that the new evangelicals were having with the fundamentalists. This warfare was a resurrection of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, only the new evangelicals were now seen as the modernists (or at least leaning in a modernistic direction). Furthermore, this polemical in-house fighting helped to stifle the new evangelical agenda both socially and intellectually. Their energy was primarily being spent in defending themselves as well as attempting to resolve the theological controversies of their fundamentalist predecessors at an intellectually more credible level. History has yet to show that they have accomplished the later.

evangelicals, but for the fundamentalists as well.[67] All of this, combined with the new evangelical compulsion to settle the theological debates of the preceding generation at a higher level, kept the new evangelicalism sidetracked from their initial goals stemming from 1947.[68] Despite the fact that the new evangelical intellectuals had become bogged down by their attempts at undoing the previous generation's theological blunders, and by their warfare with militant fundamentalists, they still managed to go on with an intellectual agenda that would most definitely show signs of improvement with a higher quality of theological scholarship, yet their role as intellectuals in the evangelical community would not easily move beyond issues of theology to the broader intellectual agenda of which they originally aspired.

---

[67]Volie E. Pyles, "Bruised, Bloodied, and Broken:' Fundamentalism's Internecine Controversy in the 1960s," Fides et Historia 18 (October 1986): 45-55.

[68]Among these goals were the building an educational institution of what Charles Fuller referred as the "Cal Tech" of the evangelical world. The "Cal Tech" became Fuller Seminary rather than a center for high level scholarship at the university level. Another goal was the production of intellectually sophisticated works of new evangelical scholarship, which ultimately became a more sophisticated line of polemical treatise of little interest to the greater academic community. See Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, pp. 65-68.

Chapter 4

THE INTELLECTUAL AGENDA OF THE NEW EVANGELICALS

> The Protestant Reformation was launched by a cadre of intellectuals, but the latter-day heirs of the Reformation sometimes seem determined to do everything they can to live down the past. . . .The Christian intellectual of the twentieth century has no such sense of belonging. He is no longer in the vanguard, he is more often on the defensive.[1]

An overview of Christian history will reveal clearly that Christians have been anything but anti-intellectual. Fundamentalism in the twentieth century is by no means an adequate representation of the intellectual breadth of historic Christianity. As we have already shown, fundamentalists in the 1920s and 1930s, rather than being anti-intellectual, were selectively intellectual, hanging all matters of intellect subordinately on the hinge of biblical authority.

The tradition from which American fundamentalism evolved was uniquely intellectual. The reformers of the sixteenth century, for example, held the conviction that a life of scholarship could not be severed from the function of ministry, nor ministry from scholarship.[2] Calvin

---

[1]Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Intellectual (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 113.

[2]Edward LeRoy Long Jr., "Ministry and Scholarship in the Reformed Tradition," in Daniel B. Clendenin and W. David Buschart, ed., Scholarship, Sacraments and Service: Historical Studies in Protestant Tradition, Essays in Honor of Bard Thompson (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), p.3

himself viewed scholarship and learning as necessary vehicles by which to arrive at faith. He was opposed to the kind of religious thinking that separated the believer from scholarship.[3] The Puritans of the seventeenth century carried on the scholarly heritage of the Reformation as was demonstrated in the founding of Harvard College in 1636. In fact, a number of religiously affiliated colleges were founded before 1770, including William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Rutgers, Brown, Columbia, and Dartmouth.[4] Many of these institutions were founded for the purpose of encouraging the integration of piety and intellect at the highest levels.[5]

As we saw in chapter one, the evangelical influence in American higher education had been seriously eroded by the time that Darwinism and the European university took root in the late nineteenth century. The secularization process was

---

[3]Ibid.

[4]William C. Ringenberg, The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 39; and Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 3-22.

[5]Thomas LeDuc, Piety and Intellect at Amherst College (New York, 1946); Louise L. Stevenson, Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends: The New Haven Scholars and the Transformation of Higher Learning in America, 1830-1890 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986); Mark A.Noll, Princeton and the Republic, 1768-1822: The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); and Robert S. Shepard, God's People in the Ivory Tower: Religion in the Early American University (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991).

now in effect in American higher education.[6] The scholarly pre-fundamentalists of the early twentieth century tried to regain lost territory, but ultimately failed to stem the tide of theological change toward liberalism. It was hoped that The Fundamentals (1910-1915) would provide the intellectual push needed to state the case against modernism, but it only resulted in further intellectual alienation and isolation, and the democratization of evangelicalism into popular fundamentalism. The new evangelicals of the following generation saw the need for intellectual renewal and prepared for it by earning Ph.Ds from major American universities. The fundamentalism out of which they had come was predominantly dispensational premillennialism, yet they were now being exposed to the reformed perspectives of B. B. Warfield, J. Gresham Machen, Robert Dick Wilson, Cornelius Van Til, and Gordon Clark. As a result, the new evangelicals wanted to restore to evangelicalism the glory of the old Princeton theology. Indeed, as one historian has argued, those scholars who have attempted to bring intellectual credibility back to American Evangelicalism have been for the most part representatives of the reformed tradition in America.[7]

---

[6]Bradley J. Longfield, "From Evangelicalism to Liberalism: Public Midwestern Universities in Nineteenth-Century America," in George M. Marsden and Bradley J. Longfield, eds., The Secularization of the Academy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 46-73.

[7]George Marsden, "The State of Evangelical Christian Scholarship," p. 348. It is important to note that the

The perceived intellectual needs of which the new evangelicals spoke were primarily centered around the theological issues stemming from the late nineteenth century through the controversial years of the 1920s and 1930s. These issues included biblical inerrancy, evolutionary science, and higher criticism of the Bible. The last major attempt by conservative evangelicals to defend Orthodox Christianity against these modernistic intrusions was with the publication of The Fundamentals. As scholarly as some of the entries were for the twelve volume set, they still failed to make an impact on the greater academic community. The next generation of new evangelicals would attempt an intellectual comeback with greater success than the preceding generation. The intellectual preparation that the new evangelicals undertook to renew the obscurantistic image of fundamentalism reflected their image of themselves as the rebuilders of western civilization. Carl Henry wrote about the failure of fundamentalism to understand the demise of western civilization due to its refusal to engage the mind

---

reformed tradition is by no means the sole standard by which American evangelicalism is to be interpreted. Others have attempted to argue that wrongly interpreting evangelicalism exclusively through the reformed paradigm leaves unaccounted for the Wesleyan-holiness elements of the Church. In other words, if evangelicalism is defined according to the reformed paradigm, then the Wesleyan-holiness paradigm has to be understood as something other than evangelical. See Donald W. Dayton, "Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category `Evangelical,'" in Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston, eds., The Variety of American Evangelicalism (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991), pp. 245-251.

of modern man on a scholarly level.[8] The modern mind of western civilization was at a crossroads, according to Henry. Having recently come through the calamity of World War II, Henry says, "Now that the debacle of 1914-1945 has come, it is apparent how destructive is the sickness of our age." Out of this madness comes the perspective, stemming from three hundred and fifty years of skeptical philosophy, that nature has replaced God as an ultimate being and that man is no more than an animal.[9] The new evangelicals, therefore, saw it as their God-ordained responsibility to rebuild a philosophically corrupted western civilization. This task would be accomplished through the production of scholarly books and articles dealing with the tough issues of the day. But what exactly would be their focus of attention?

As we have seen, a number of new evangelicals attempted to escape the stigma of fundamentalism by studying at the nation's most prestigious universities, fifteen of them at Harvard.[10] Theologian and former editor of Christianity Today, Kenneth Kantzer, had a rationale for attending Harvard that is perhaps the best example why so many others in his generation made the same decision. He points out that within the world of evangelical higher education there

---

[8]Henry, The Uneasy Conscience.

[9]Carl F. H. Henry, The Remaking of the Modern Mind (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948 [1946]), pp. 19-27.

[10]Nelson, "Fundamentalism at Harvard," pp. 79-98.

were no accredited schools of which to speak. There were no quality libraries, no quality faculty, and no quality tradition in terms of scholarship. The liberal schools, on the other hand, had quality libraries, quality scholars, accreditation, and good academic reputation.[11]

The main academic focus of attention for these scholarly fundamentalists was on theology and apologetics. The fundamentalist tradition in which they had been trained offered them little encouragement of gaining the adequate intellectual tools to rebuild western civilization. But the great intellectual zeal that this generation exhibited as they returned from the universities showed little return on at least two fronts. First, rather than attaining their Ph.Ds and entering the mainstream academic community, they returned to teach in the theological seminaries and Bible schools in the evangelical subculture. Second, the kind of scholarly material they published was either at a popular level or a return to the same polemical issues about which their fundamentalist predecessors fought.[12]

The mandate to rebuild western civilization through high level academic work was a vision that placed the new evangelicals on the right track, yet their propensity of focusing their attention on the needs of the local church failed to prove to the academic community at large that they

---

[11]Mark A. Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, p. 97.

[12]Ibid., pp. 98-99.

were truly serious.[13] A number of scholarly publications, however, demonstrated the ability of the new evangelicals to deal adequately with theological and philosophical issues. Defending the faith once delivered was the main task of the new evangelicals.[14] While not all those within the new evangelical intelligentsia were trained apologists, it is still clear that making evangelical Christianity credible before a watching world was the main agenda for this generation. Apologetic literature was by no means unique to this generation. Numerous apologetic books from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were published in defense of evangelical orthodoxy against modernism. The scholarly examples of Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, B. B. Warfield, and J. Gresham Machen most likely lingered in the minds of the new evangelicals as they set out to reconstruct a new scholarly Christian world view. But, the overall outdated quality of this scholarly material left them with inadequate intellectual ammunition.

As we have shown, the majority of the scholarly activity within the new evangelicalism was focused on theological issues.[15] The quality of their theological

---

[13]Hatch, "Evangelicalism as a Democratic Movement," p. 79.

[14]Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, February 6, 1951. Box 35, OP, GC.

[15]This was often evidenced by the publication of lists of choice evangelical books. "Choice" evangelical books usually meant books concerned with biblical studies and theology. See "Choice Evangelical Books of 1962,"

scholarship was certainly a step up from the intellectually mediocre scholarship of their fundamentalist predecessors, yet based on their publication record, there is little evidence that they moved beyond the theological conundrums that haunted the previous generation. But within the circle of the new evangelicals there was a great deal of confidence that they were making intellectual in-roads with their publishing. Secular presses were now engaging evangelicals and helping to place them in the academic mainstream. Secular press editors gave the new evangelicals assurance that there has been no conspiracy against publishing evangelicals, only that the quality of scholarship among evangelicals had been so poor.[16] The increase in publishing with secular presses came about when intellectual changes began taking place within evangelicalism. The new evangelicals showed an openness toward dialogue with non-evangelicals, a contempt for separatism, and desire for higher quality education.[17] The new evangelicals had a high opinion of their academic accomplishments, often referring to the "world shaking" evangelical literature that was rolling off the presses.

Several accomplishments were made in terms of new

Christianity Today 7 (February 1, 1963): 13.

[16]"Upturn in Evangelical Publishing," Christianity Today 2 (February 17, 1958): 20-21.

[17]Harold John Ockenga to Carl F. H. Henry, November 3, 1959. Folder 7, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

evangelical publishing during the 1950s and 1960s. Perhaps the most significant was the six volume "Contemporary Evangelical Thought" series that was edited by Carl Henry. This series was published between 1957 and 1969 with the intention of furthering evangelical convictions on a variety of theological issues. Published by Channel Press, the first volume, Contemporary Evangelical Thought (1957), was to be a pace-setting volume for the whole series. Prominent evangelicals scholars contributed chapters on subjects dealing with the Old Testament, ethics, apologetics, education, and evangelism. The table of contents in this volume shows clearly that the main focus of attention for the evangelicals was theology. In fact, this volume is the only one in the series that even hints at any scholarly diversity outside of theology. The titles of the other five volumes communicated a clear concern for theological scholarship. Revelation and the Bible (1959); Basic Christian Doctrine (1962); Christian Faith and Modern Theology (1964); Jesus of Nazareth: Savior and Lord (1966); and Fundamentals of the Faith (1969). The last volume is reminiscent of the twelve volume set of The Fundamentals that was published between 1910 and 1915. Interestingly, the content of this work shows a striking similarity to the content of the original twelve volume set. The original twelve volume set dealt with such issues as biblical inerrancy, the historicity of the resurrection, the deity of Christ, the second coming od Christ, and evolutionism versus

creationism. The later publication by the new evangelicals dealt with the same issues, yet with an up-to-date flavor. The theological concerns of the new evangelicals were essentially the same as those in the preceding fundamentalist generation.

Much of the success that the new evangelicals enjoyed through publishing was due to the efforts of the William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company in Grand Rapids, Michigan. The influence of Eerdmans paralleled the influence of the Dutch Reformed perspective on American evangelicalism. The Dutch Reformed community had remained out of touch with the mainline evangelical denominations which had been torn by the fundamentalist-modernist flap.[18] The nineteenth century revivalist tradition out of which fundamentalism emerged was not well received by the numerous Reformed denominations. The Dutch Reformed supported serious scholarly work with a strong philosophical orientation that the evangelical world had not recently experienced.[19] Following World War II, Eerdmans began publishing a number of significant new evangelical works. One of the first to be published was Carl Henry's Remaking the Modern Mind in 1946 followed by his Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism in 1947. In the

---

[18]By mainline denominations I mean such groups as the northern Presbyterians and Baptists, various non-denominational community Churches, many Methodists and Wesleyan Churches. Some Lutheran and Episcopalian Churches were involved in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, but not to the degree of others mentioned above.

[19]Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, pp. 100-101.

years to follow they published Carnell's Introduction to Christian Apologetics (1948), the commentaries of John Calvin in English, and Geerhardus Vos's Biblical Theology.[20] Eerdmans' later publication of Bernard Ramm's A Christian View of Science and Scripture (1954) marked a unique passage of the new evangelicals into recognizing the need and validity of scientific inquiry for the study of theology. This book was an attempt to encourage Christians to accept "true advances" in scientific knowledge and not uninformed theological biases.[21]

The amount of publishing that the new evangelicals were doing got the attention of their more liberal theological counterparts. Arnold W. Hearn from Union Theological Seminary observed that the new evangelicals were finally producing literature that showed they had become more open to arguing their case in ways relevant to the mind of modern man. Their publications demonstrated a wider interest in theological issues, a greater respect for philosophy, an honest acceptance of the results of science, social ethics, and the arts.[22]

Self-assured statements that evangelicals were taking their place in the world of higher education were also being

---

[20]Ibib., p. 101.

[21]Ibid., p. 95.

[22]Gasper, The Fundamentalist Movement, pp. 115-116.

published on a regular basis in evangelical periodicals.[23] There were some in their ranks, however, who were honest enough to criticize the new evangelical leadership for intellectual mediocrity. It was argued that if there was to be any significant progress in the intellectual status of evangelicalism, then it had to come about with a growing educated leadership. The task of an educated leadership is to repent of its lack of involvement in the intellectual arena and to assume the responsibility of moving forward with a new scholarly agenda.[24] This educated leadership is finally moving ahead with "a mass of modern, useful publications and enlightened teaching."[25] Critics argued that this endeavor was of vital importance since it would allow evangelicals the opportunity to more adequately deal with the surrounding culture.[26] Bernard Ramm asked the question of his generation, "Are We Obscurantists?" His answer was targeted more toward critics outside of evangelicalism who had a tendency to view evangelicals in

---

[23]"The Evangelical Thrust," Christianity Today 6 (February 2, 1962): 28-29; In one issue of CT twenty five religious leaders were interviewed on the question of crucial junctures with Christianity. A number of them concluded that the most important development was the renewal of high level evangelical scholarship. See "Modern Christianity's Crucial Junctures," Christianity Today 8 (October 11, 1963).

[24]E. M. Blaiklock, "The Task of Educated Leadership," Christianity Today 7 (February 15, 1963): 5-7.

[25]Ibid.

[26]James Forrester, "Imperatives in Higher Education," Christianity Today (May 10, 1963): 7-8.

the same light as they viewed fundamentalists. As non-thinking obscurantists.[27]

The extensive publishing agenda of the new evangelicals was successful in demonstrating their growing theological sophistication, but the much of the subject matter of their publications reflected a rehashing of the same theological issues of the fundamentalist-modernist debates. While the new evangelicals had become more sophisticated with their credible Ph.Ds and willingness to dialogue with liberal scholars, issues such as inerrancy and creation-science seemed to find their way to the forefront of their academic concerns.[28] By the 1970s, the debates over the issues of biblical authority and faith and science would become

---

[27]Bernard Ramm, "Are We Obscurantists?" Christianity Today 1 (February 18, 1957): 14-15.

[28]The following articles are a select example of the massive literature published on biblical authority and creation-science. H. Daniel Friberg,"The Word of God and `Propositional Truth," Christianity Today 7 (July 5, 1963): 19-21; Daniel P. Fuller, "How Modern Theologians Interpret the Bible," Eternity 14 (September 1963): 31-35; Robert H. Mounce, "The Art of Interpreting Revelation," Eternity 17 (February 1966): 21-22, 39, 41; Robert H. Mounce, "Clues to Understanding Biblical Accuracy," Eternity 17 (June 1966): 16-18; Klaas Runia, "The Modern Debate Around the Bible," Christianity Today 12 (July 5, 1968): 12-15; Walter E. Lammerts, "Growing Doubts: Is Evolutionary Theory Valid?" Christianity Today 6 (September 14, 1962): 3-6; Albert Hyma, "Darwinism or Christianity," Christianity Today 6 (September 14, 1962): 7-9; Martin J. Buerger, "Scientists and God," Christianity Today 8 (August 28, 1964): 6-8; Lawrence Kulp, "Must We Be Afraid of Science?" Eternity 14 (May 1963): 16-18; Vannevar Bush, "Where Science Must Be Silent," Eternity 16 (October 1965): 8; Bernard Ramm, "Science Vs. Theology--The Battle Isn't Over Yet," Eternity 16 (October 1965): 16-20, 43; and "Does the Bible Conflict with Modern Science?" Christianity Today 10 (January 21, 1966): 3-6.

watershed issues for many evangelicals.

No matter how many evangelical seminaries were making their impact on seminary education, the new evangelicals were still concerned that "the number of first-class seminaries is still too small."[29] The overall intellectual concern for the new evangelicals was continually stated as concern for building and nurturing top rate scholars within evangelical seminaries.

> There are few scholars who can claim the academic competence or authority of their non-evangelical counterparts. The production of such scholars in the future depends on fuller concern for our seminaries.[30]

This statement fails to identify the academic vocations of the non-evangelical counterparts to which the evangelical scholars fail to measure up. The above mentioned counterparts are most likely their liberal theological counterparts, yet this contradicts the new evangelical claim that they were going to impact modern society on all levels. Why was it necessary to rely on the seminaries for the production of up-to-snuff evangelical scholars when the secular academic world was making an impact in areas outside theology? The preoccupation with theological education was an intellectual barometer that pointed toward a codependent relationship with fundamentalism.

Despite their enthusiasm over the improvement in theological education, it was also acknowledged that there

---

[29]"The Evangelical Thrust," pp. 28-29.

[30]Ibid.

was an overemphasis on apologetics. Arguably, there is a place for apologetics "but a theology which is always concerned to meet some trend, or to establish its own validity, is vitiated from the start and is unlikely to reach its goal." Evangelical theology should be able to stand on its own and not have to give an account to disciplines outside theology, but instead call them into account. Evangelical theology continues to remain defensive toward other schools of theology and to disciplines outside the realm of theology.[31] This particular attitude on behalf of the new evangelical intellectuals is reminiscent of the way in which the early twentieth century fundamentalists perceived themselves in relation to the modernists of their day. Fundamentalists were vehement about calling the modernists into subordination to their biblically informed opinions, obstinately closing themselves off to criticism.

But the intellectual and social issues the new evangelicals were concerned about were in no way an indication that they had successfully created a relevant intellectual strategy for dealing with issues outside the realm of theology. Whenever intellectual challenges confronted the new evangelicals, the theologians were usually the ones called upon for the answers. This comes as no surprise given the fact that the theologians were major representatives in the new evangelical movement. Yet by the

---

[31] Ibid.

1960s, a substantial number of non-theological intellectuals were writing for Christianity Today and Eternity magazines, thereby offering some hope that the new evangelicals were on their way to making an impact both intellectually and socially. Much of what the new evangelicals wanted to prove was the compatibility of Christianity with rigorous intellectual inquiry. One pertinent example was a higher education issue of Christianity Today which featured gospel testimonies from Christian scholars "of devout evangelical persuasion" in some of America's most prestigious universities. This list included Robert B. Fischer, Professor of Chemistry, Indiana University; C. C. Morrill, Department of Veterinary Pathology, Michigan State University; Richard D. Campbell, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, State University of Iowa; James H. Roberts, Professor of Physics, Northwestern University; James H. Shaw, Associate Professor of Biological Chemistry, Harvard University; John A. McIntyre, Physics Department, Yale University; and Rene de Visme Williamson, Professor of Government, Louisiana State University, to name just a few.[32] To augment the testimonies of the professors, CT also included the testimonies of Christian students to get a glimpse of how they exercise their faith on secular

---

[32]"Testimonies of Professors," Christianity Today 7 (February 15, 1963): 8-12; and "The Image of the Secular Collegian," pp. 13-14.

campuses.[33]

Unlike the fundamentalists of the 1920s and 1930s, new evangelicals were in favor of Christians being involved in the secular academic arena. One scholar suggested that evangelicals need to be less fearful of confronting intellectuals on secular campuses. "Secularization need not be anti-Christian, and the Christian need not fear it. It may even be beneficial to Christianity and to the dissemination of Christian thought."[34] The main theme that new evangelical intellectuals liked to broach was the idea of the integration of Christian faith and learning, or better known as the Christian world view.[35] The foundation for the integration of faith and learning has its footings in Dutch Reformed theology, particularly in the thought of the theologian and statesman Abraham Kuyper (1837 - 1920). Kuyper's Calvinistic Christianity sought to engage not only religion but also politics, the arts, and economics. He often made reference to the engagement of, "every sphere of life." His Calvinism "created a life and world view," designed to fit "every department of life."[36] The new

---

[33]"Testimonies of Students," Christianity Today 7 (February 15, 1963): 15-17.

[34]C. P. S. Taylor, "Christian Opportunity on the Secular Campus," Christianity Today 12 (September 27, 1968): 3-6.

[35]John W. Snyder, "Christians in the Academic Arena," Christianity Today 13 (October 11, 1968): 10-11.

[36]James D. Bratt, Dutch Calvinism in Modern America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), pp. 14-33.

evangelicals, though not entirely Dutch Reformed in their thinking, agreed with Kuyper's thesis that Western civilization was in a battle between competing worldviews.[37]

Carl Henry followed Kuyper's lead. "As never before, humanity is confronted by two world-views, two life-views, the divergences between which are quite plain in every department of interpretation."[38] Henry, like Kuyper, agreed that there were two distinct ways of looking at the world; One, through the lens of revelational philosophy, the other, through the lens of anti-theistic philosophy. As a major leader in the development of the new evangelicalism, Henry set an early precedent for intellectual and cultural involvement for his generation.[39] The motivation behind the intellectual excitement of the new evangelicals was in large part due to the new emphasis on developing a "Christian worldview." Periodicals like Christianity Today and Eternity existed for this very reason with regular publication of articles dealing with Christian social responsibility, education, economics, philosophy, the arts, theology, and Church life.[40]

---

[37]Marsden, Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism, p. 108.

[38]Henry, Remaking the Modern Mind, 238-239.

[39]Henry, The Uneasy Conscience.

[40]It has been suggested that in spite of Christianity Today's rhetoric about evangelical social responsibility, there were often less than socially responsible articles and editorials published in its pages. By the late 1960s, the magazine appeared to take a more conservative stand against

Despite the security that the new evangelicals felt in their pursuit of an intellectual agenda, the concern that modern learning is potentially dangerous to students and the church was still on their minds. Higher education was seen by some as a kind of "Frankenstein's monster" that possessed a mythology all its own. The myth of human progress, the "natural goodness of man," the myth of egalitarianism, and the cult of scientism.[41] Warnings from new evangelicals about the intellectual dangers on the secular university campuses were reminiscent of the ways in which early twentieth century fundamentalists warned of modern learning in their day.[42] These concerns were not as widespread among the new evangelicals as they were among the fundamentalists, yet the generation that followed the new evangelical movement[43] continued to accept at least some of the

---

many of the precepts of social action. See Robert Booth Fowler, A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966 - 1976 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 43-60. The following articles are a sample of the various topics that some new evangelicals published: Rudy Nelson, "The Cultural Barrenness of Today's Evangelicals," Eternity 10 (November 1959): 18-20; Alvin Plantinga, "Analytic Philosophy and Christianity," Christianity Today 8 (October 25, 1963): 17-20; Grant Reynard, "Christians and Art: A Painter's View," Christianity Today 8 (January 31, 1964): 3-5; "Philosophers and the Faith," Christianity Today 12 (February 2, 1968): 28-29.

[41]Calvin D. Linton, "Higher Education: The Solution-or Part of the Problem?" Christianity Today 12 (February 16, 1968): 3-8.

[42]John Redekop, "Will Faith Survive College?" Eternity 21 (June 1970): 15-17, 42.

[43]I have designated this generation to be primarily evangelicals from the baby boomer generation. This

fundamentalist rhetoric against higher learning.[44] The new evangelicals showed a great deal of concern about the health of evangelical liberal arts colleges. They encouraged evangelical colleges to produce scholars and scholarship to meet the intellectual needs of the day, but the context was more often in reference to creating apologists and good apologetic literature. One Christian college professor asked his students, "Where are the books? Isn't there anyone in orthodox ranks today good enough to write an acceptable textbook on theology, Church history or apologetics? Why must we use a textbook written about the turn of the century?"[45] The new evangelicals recognized the fact that evangelical liberal arts colleges had problems that were not going to easily go away. One significant problem was whether or not it was the purpose of the Christian College to

---

generation failed to embrace much of the vision that Carl Henry, Billy Graham, and Harold Ockenga developed after World War 2. See Augustus Cerillo, Jr. and Murray W. Dempster, Salt and Light: Evangelical Political Thought in Modern America (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989); and Richard Quebedeaux, The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy (New York: Harper and Row, 1974).

[44]This is most evident in the local church than among evangelical scholars. Evangelical scholars most prone to suspicion of higher learning are those associated with the more conservative end of the evangelical spectrum. Most separatist fundamentalists to this day hold an acute suspicion of secular higher learning.

[45]"A Place for Scholarship," Moody Monthly 60 (June 1960): 11. The scholars held up as examples in this editorial were theologians like Machen, Orr, and Wilson. Once again a return to the theologians for the resolution of intellectual problems. See also, "Of Making Many Books," Eternity 6 (September 1955): 6.

produce good scholars or good Christians. It was understood that ideally there should be a balance between both extremes, yet for some reason evangelicals have a difficult time resolving the tension.[46] Outside critics argued that the evangelical colleges are inferior intellectual ghettos. If this is true then perhaps it would be more beneficial to promote a Christian witness on the secular university campus. To avoid the problem of ghettoization evangelical colleges need to start communicating to its students a vision for education that contains both the scientific method and revealed truth. "A Christian faculty must recognize that academic witness to the truth is fully as important as ringing doorbells."[47] Since 1940, evangelicals had expanded various ministries on secular college campuses for the purpose of individual evangelism. Under the guidance of C. Stacey Woods the InterVarsity Christian Fellowship emerged in 1940 as both a ministry to the unconverted college student and as a haven of rest for Christian students on the secular campus. Woods believed that the secular university was the safest place for the Christian student as long as he is in the will of God. It is also a

---

[46]The following article goes two years beyond the time frame of this particular study. James Chapman, "Christian Colleges Need to Shape Up," Eternity 21 (June 1970): 23, 30.

[47]"The Crisis of the Christian Colleges," Christianity Today 6 (August 31, 1962): 28-31; and David L. McKenna, "Evangelical Colleges and the Race for Relevance," Christianity Today 8 (February 28, 1964): 13-17.

field of opportunity for those students to be a witness to the non-believer.[48] The Campus Crusade for Christ ministry emerged in 1951 under the leadership of Bill Bright. Campus Crusade was less concerned with engaging secular intellectuals than it was with evangelizing students in a manner not unlike that of Billy Graham. Bright himself decided while a student at Fuller Seminary that the needs of the world are too great than to waste time with intellectual preparation. He determined that he would lay aside his studies and pursue the evangelization of students.[49] Ironically, Bill Bright has since established the International School of Theology for the purpose of training Campus Crusade staffers. The development of these campus ministries was not directly related to the new evangelical intellectual agenda, yet they tied into the expressed desire to make the gospel more relevant to the needs of American culture. Regardless of the expressed concerns over the state of the evangelical colleges, very little had been done to move beyond the theological issues that occupied the minds of the new evangelical leadership. As we have already shown, the unresolved theological issues of the previous fundamentalist generation kept the new evangelicals locked

---

[48]For an outstanding history of the InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, See Keith and Gladys Hunt, For Christ and the University: The Story of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship of the U. S. A./ 1940 - 1990 (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991).

[49]Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 90.

into a mindset that catered almost exclusively to theological scholarship.

In the early 1960s, there was a glimmer of hope that the new evangelicals would be able to extend their intellectual vision into the realm of university education and scholarship. Talk of a major evangelical research university began as early as 1955 with plans to build it on the campus on Gordon College in Massachusetts. Billy Graham was elected as a trustee, and a committee was assembled to begin plans to start the process.[50] Wilbur Smith informed Carl Henry that Billy Graham not only wanted to establish a university at Gordon, but eventually he wanted to build three more throughout the country.[51] Interest in building a research university was discussed in a number of articles. In an editorial Carl Henry said that he felt that the time had come for the building of an evangelical university. The intellectual state of the modern mind makes the need for such a university mandatory.[52] The time frame for the opening of classes was to be September 1963,[53] but the idea for such an institution "never got beyond the talking

---

[50]Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, October 10, 1955. Box 35, GC. OP.

[51]Wilbur Smith to Carl Henry, February 5, 1962. File 20, Box 16, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[52]"Do We Need a Christian University?" Christianity Today 4 (May 9, 1960): 5.

[53]"Do We Need a Christian University?" The Standard 50 (June 13, 1960):13.

stage." It's not entirely clear just why the evangelical research university never got off the ground. Marsden argues that there may have been things within the evangelical and fundamentalist communities that were considered more important. One major problem that evangelicals have fallen victim to is the problem of fragmentation. Evangelicals have divided into so many different groups that it is difficult to pull the people and resources together to make something like a research university work.[54] Many evangelical denominations had their own Bible colleges and liberal arts colleges that existed for no other reason than to support the denomination.[55] Often times the graduates of many of these denominational schools return with Ph.Ds to teach in their alma maters. There are a number of reasons why support for an evangelical university failed to take form. First, was a lack of cohesion within the group that was spearheading the project. It was feared, for instance, that Billy Graham would somehow wind up as the university's president, thus taking him away from his real calling as an evangelist. Second, wealthy contributors like J. Howard Pew and Maxey Jarman were not enthusiastic about putting their money into a university

---

[54]George M. Marsden, "Why No Major Evangelical University? The Loss and Recovery of Evangelical Advanced Scholarship." in Joel A. Carpenter and Kenneth W. Shipps, eds., Making Higher Education Christian: The History and Mission of Evangelical Colleges in America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 294-303.

[55]Ibid.

project. Pew was considering putting his money into a seminary project instead and Jarman was suspicious of higher learning and feared the modern academy's slippery slope into liberalism. He was more in favor of Bible schools. Third, the evangelical liberal arts colleges were fearful that a research university would steal their finest scholars. Some evangelical college administrators suggested that it might be better to develop graduate programs at the already existing colleges. And, finally, there was a concern that evangelical convictions would not be upheld at a Christian university. As a result, the evangelical research university never came to fruition.[56] Carl Henry later commented that the amount of money it would take to run a Christian university, particularly in the area of scientific research, would be too high. It was his vision, however, to see great inroads in the area of the philosophy of science.[57] The non-existence of an evangelical research university is in some respects the major indicator of the ultimate lack of value that the new evangelicals placed on their intellectual agenda. Nathan Hatch put it best in his analysis of the intellectual commitments of evangelical colleges since World War II.

> In recent years evangelicals have come to raise the alarm about the pervasive secularism of modern

---

[56]Ibid.

[57]Carl F. H. Henry, Conversations with Carl Henry: Christianity for Today (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), p. 73.

> intellectual life and its repercussions in legislation, ethics, and jurisprudence; yet they have done almost nothing to address the root problem. The battle for the mind cannot be waged by mobilizing in the streets or on Capitol Hill, nor by denouncing more furiously the secular humanists.[58]

The intellectual agenda of the new evangelicals was quintessentially a theological agenda that catered to the pastoral needs of the Church at large with its emphasis on theological issues. Few would dispute the fact that the new evangelicals made significant strides in the field of theology and apologetics, yet the lack of progress in disciplines outside of theology showed that the new evangelicals did not fully understand the concept of the integration of faith and learning that had inspired the creation of the Free University of Amsterdam by Abraham Kuyper in the Netherlands.

Engaging culture at the highest intellectual levels seems to presuppose that the new evangelicals had a responsibility to prepare for such a venture. Whether or not they understood the ultimate responsibility of this task is yet to be seen. The continual warfare with separatist fundamentalists and the ongoing attempts to reconcile the issues of the fundamentalist-modernist controversy certainly kept the new evangelicals from gaining an even greater intellectual vision. As we showed in chapter two, E. J.

---

[58]Nathan O. Hatch, "Evangelical Colleges and the Challenge of Christian Thinking," in Joel A. Carpenter and Kenneth W. Shipps, eds., Making Higher Education Christian: The History and Mission of Evangelical Colleges in America (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 155-171.

Carnell was a unique intellectual in the community of new evangelical scholarship. He found it necessary to dispense with fundamentalism in order to make the new evangelical vision work. Although he was a theologian-philosopher by trade, Carnell was the kind of intellectual visionary who could transcend the world of theology and see the importance of engaging the mind at every level possible. His vision alone makes the story of the new evangelicals worth understanding. In many ways he was an outsider among his people, yet his intellectual vision was a demonstration of the depth and potential of the new evangelical intellectual agenda.

Chapter 5

THE INTELLECTUAL VISION OF EDWARD JOHN CARNELL

> Most seminaries are at the mercy of the Christian community for yearly operating funds. And since money connotes power, a fear of this power may induce an administrator to conform his educational policies to the will of those who control the finances . . . . Freedom to teach according to the dictates of one's conscience is an inalienable right. It cannot be given nor should it be removed, by man.[1]

Prior to the first scholarly apologetic written by Carnell, was Wilbur Smith's Therefore Stand published in 1945.[2] This book preceded the official founding of the new evangelical movement, but in many ways laid the foundation for a number of aspiring apologists in the new evangelical generation. Smith had no formal academic training, yet he was still held in high regard by many for his writing and vast knowledge. His book, however, was not accepted as the kind of critical work that was necessary for the new evangelical cause. He once lamented to Carl Henry his disappointment that no one contended with his book in a chapter on apologetics in a book edited by Henry entitled Contemporary Evangelical Thought (1957). Henry told Smith that the reason his book was not contended with was that it

---

[1]"The Glory of a Theological Seminary," Inaugural Address of Edward John Carnell, President of Fuller Theological Seminary, 1954-1959. Delivered May 17, 1955. (Fuller Theological Seminary Alumni Association, Pasadena, California).

[2]Wilbur M. Smith, Therefore Stand: A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity (Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1945).

was more concerned with "Christian evidences rather than philosophical apologetics."[3] This statement tells us a great deal about the intellectual direction that the new evangelicals were moving. No longer would they be satisfied with scholarship without credentials.[4] Carnell's Introduction to Christian Apologetics (1948) came on the heels of his appointment at Fuller as an Associate Professor of Systematic Theology. He had been a professor of philosophy and religion at Gordon College and Divinity School in Boston since 1945. He came to Fuller with the zealous desire to help build the new evangelical vision of Ockenga. Upon learning of his clearance to come to Fuller he told Ockenga, "This is a great moment in my life because I sincerely feel that I have a real contribution to make to the new evangelicalism."[5] His book was originally titled The Logic of Conservative Christianity,[6] but had been

---

[3]Carl F. H. Henry to Gordon H. Clark, April 26, 1957. Folder 12, Box 15, Collection 8, CT Records. GA.

[4]The rules were sometimes changed as was indicated by the willingness of Ockenga to overlook Wilbur Smith's lack of educational preparation for a position at Fuller. See Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 35, footnote 5.

[5]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, February 27, 1948. Box 35, OP, GC. In another letter to Ockenga, Carnell wrote that he and his wife were "continuing in earnest intercession upon our going out west, that God will give us humility, skill, and drive as we take our part in the unified movement to define the New Evangelicalism in this generation." Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, March 21, 1948. Box 35, OP, GC.

[6]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, September 12, 1947. Box 35, OP, GC.

changed by the time it was published in 1948, perhaps due to editorial suggestions. Carnell's apologetic thesis begins with an analysis of human predicament in the world. He can choose to commit suicide; ignore his situation; admit his situation and learn to get along with it; or he can search to see if there is meaning to his life. The Christian, says Carnell, has chosen to "challenge the whole interpretation of nature itself, to see if there is not rational meaning to the basic movement of things."[7] Carnell recognized that there were two different philosophical extremes: rationalism and empiricism.[8] The Christian must settle somewhere in between these two options.[9] The Christian world view, according to Carnell, can be defended with as much credibility as modern science. His book also dealt with the problem of evil, the nature of faith, the question of biblical criticism, proof for the resurrection of Jesus, Christian faith and science, and the possibility of miracles. There is little question that Carnell made an impact with this book, at least on the evangelical

---

[7]Edward John Carnell, An Introduction to Christian Apologetics: A Philosophical Defense of the Trinitarian-Theistic Faith (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), p. 353.

[8]Evangelical apologists have been divided between two basic camps. The Presuppositionalists and the Evidentialists. Presuppositionalists embrace a rationalistic model, while evidentialists embrace the empirical model.

[9]Carnell, An Introduction, p. 7.

community.[10] Eerdmans Publishing Company elected the book for its $5,000.00 Evangelical Book Award. It was selected by a "unanimous decision of the judges for its outstanding excellence and its sound and vigorous evangelical Christian approach."[11] Carnell's joy over this award gave him extra zeal to pursue research on a number of other topics, one of which was his reworked Harvard dissertation, The Theology of Reinhold Niebuhr. This work was to be the first in a "three-volume work on neo-orthodoxy."[12] Carnell's passion for research and writing came through in his correspondence with Ockenga. He told Ockenga on several occasions of his desire to produce scholarly books for the cause of the kingdom. One important and timely area, for example, was on the question of the inspiration of the Bible. Carnell had established plans to do a work called "A Philosophy of Plenary Inspiration." He planned to fire his "best apologetic guns on the subject."[13] This book was never

---

[10]The book was at least impressive enough to go through four different printings. Carnell mentioned that he had spoken at a U.C.L.A. Inter Varsity meeting where he sold seven copies of his book. This gives some indication that he was known to some extent. See Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, December 6, 1948. Box 35, OP, GC.

[11]"Professor Edward John Carnell is Winner of $5,000.00 Eerdmans Evangelical Book Award," Eerdmans Quarterly Observer (Spring, 1948).

[12]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, January 18, 1948; and Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, December 6, 1948. Box 35, OP, GC.

[13]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, December 4. 1951. Box 35, OP, GC.

published (or written) for reasons unknown, though his time consuming presidency at Fuller Seminary may have sidetracked him from the project. Carnell, like no other new evangelical in his generation, possessed a certain restlessness regarding the need to be continually researching and publishing. His repertoire of subjects included a book on television entitled, Television: Servant or Master? (1950). This book was a good example of how evangelicals were attempting to deal with current issues. Television was still in its infancy when Carnell wrote the book, but for the sake of his own subculture, he thought that "evangelicals need guidance on the question."[14] The television book was also an example of Carnell's popular writing, though he never let his intellectual focus get away from his greater agenda to remake the modern mind at the highest levels.[15] Other books by Carnell include A Philosophy of the Christian Religion (1952); Christian Commitment (1957); The Case for Orthodox Theology (1959); The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life (1960); and The Burden of Soren Kierkegaard (1965). While most of his magazine articles were directed at a more popular audience[16]

---

[14]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, January 11, 1949. Box 35, OP, GC.

[15]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, June 11, 1949. Box 35, OP, GC.

[16]He wrote for a variety of popular Christian periodicals like Moody Monthly, Christianity Today, His, Christian Century, and the Watchman-Examiner.

the books were a part of Carnell's desire to make a significant impact on the life of the mind in America. But Carnell's zeal seemed to subside between the years of 1948 and 1952. In the preface to the fourth edition of An Introduction to Christian Apologetics, Carnell wrote that when a scholar publishes his first book, he is filled with "academic pride," thinking "that he has made a `great' contribution to contemporary literature." His attitude changes a great deal once the second edition is printed. He comes to realize that his insights have not made much of an impact on the world, and that critical reviews have exposed inconsistencies in the book. The author no longer expects to be famous or identified as a profound thinker. By the time the third and fourth editions arrive, the author has resigned himself to the realization that rather than having "national prominence," he accepts "complete obscurity." Carnell even mentioned that "the author's best friends have not troubled themselves to read the publication."[17]

He does not mention just who those best friends might be who have failed to read his book, but there may be some indication in his correspondence with Ockenga. On at least two different occasions when Carnell sent Ockenga a copy of two of his books, Ockenga responded by saying that he was only "able to finger the book and glance at its titles and

---

[17]Carnell, An Introduction to Christian Apologetics, p. 9.

format."[18] For the other book he admitted only to reading the first chapter and glancing "over the headings and the general plan of the book." This was in reference to Carnell's A Philosophy of the Christian Religion in which he said that it "is not a book one would sit down and read through from beginning to end, yet I most certainly am going to read snatches of it as I get a chance and try to go through the whole book in the reasonable future."[19]

Carnell's zeal in the early days of his academic career may have been attributable to the typical energetic excitement that most young aspiring scholars experience. There are often grand visions that they will make an impact in their field. His degenerating sense of intellectual value, while somewhat linked to his emotional struggles[20],

---

[18]Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, February 6, 1951. Box 35, OP, GC.

[19]Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, January 31, 1952. Box 35, OP, GC.

[20]Carnell suffered from an emotional collapse in the last decade of his life. He underwent extensive psychotherapy, including at least seven shock treatments. Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, March 15, 1962; Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, June 25, 1961. Box 35, OP, GC; The exact reason for his breakdown is not known, though some have questioned whether his struggles were linked to his personal struggle with Christianity. See Nelson, The Making and Unmaking, pp. 112-115, 171-172; Carnell alludes to his strict upbringing as the reason for his emotional struggles. In a letter to Ockenga he says, "I never realized that it was possible to suffer with such intense inwardness, while at the same time giving the outward impression that all is well. Sometimes anxiety rolls over me with the force of a terrible tidal wave. The problem stems from my childhood, of course, for I was raised in an atmosphere where my ability to make and live with decisions was impaired." Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga,

may also be a common experience for many scholars once they've put some years of experience behind them. While there may be a degree of merit to this in Carnell's case, there is some question of whether his sense of obscurity was partially based on his discouragement with the academic shortsightedness of many of his colleagues.

Ockenga had been the acting president of Fuller from its founding in 1947 until 1954, when Carnell was elected to the office of president. He felt no regrets that he had to temporarily lay aside his academic activities. All of this was for the sake of building a top rate academic institution. Carnell believed that he had the necessary tools to bring about an intellectual revolution at Fuller. Realizing what was involved in this venture, he assured Ockenga of his ability to get the job done.

> It is probably the last chance in our generation to gather a group of scholars in one company of fellowship for the cause of evangelical work. If we drop the ball here, well, gloom is ahead. As I told the faculty, therefore, I consider myself a sacrifice, in a sense, for the school. Preferring to remain in the cloistered walls of scholarship, I am glad to bring whatever gifts and wisdom I have to bear on the office of president. . . .Convinced that <u>someone</u> must head the school who knows education, theology, and the art of diplomacy, I could not in honesty let another do a task that I had been called upon to perform.[21]

January 23, 1961; Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, January 12, 1961. Box 35, OP, GC.

[21]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, October 10, 1954; Carnell enthusiastically foresaw that his "Tenure in office will have achieved the important goal of lifting the morale of the seminary and of holding the school on a course of steady scholarship. Decisions have been made and policies set which will go far in making a sound educational

It was also Carnell's desire to maintain an atmosphere that was conducive to the spiritual growth of the students. Combining the highest level of academic excellence and spiritual life was, in Carnell's opinion, representative of the purposes of the founders of Fuller.[22] Throughout his presidency, Carnell continued to voice his opposition to fundamentalism. He took comfort in the fact that the seminary's educational philosophy owed its allegiance to the wisdom and leading of Ockenga. Apart from Ockenga's leadership, Carnell said, "this school could have very easily have been sold into the hands of fundamentalism."[23] Carnell expressed this same sentiment to Gordon Clark. "The situation was such that I simply could not sit back and watch the school go into the wrong hands by default."[24] This perspective did not keep him from concluding that fundamentalism was still represented at Fuller. He acknowledged that in all of the discussions among the faculty, there are represented a "plurality of points of view." On the one side there were the usual "old guard" fundamentalists which included Charles Woodbridge, Carl

---

philosophy here in the future." See Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, September 22, 1955. Box 35, OP, GC.

[22]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, November 2, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

[23]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, May 23, 1955. Box 35, OP, GC.

[24]This is a quote from a letter Carnell wrote to Gordon Clark on October 25, 1954. Quoted in Rudolph Nelson, The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind, p. 86.

Henry, Wilbur Smith, and Gleason Archer. "They are solicitous," says Carnell, "in detecting any departure from the fundamentalist position." On the other side were the more progressive of the Fuller faculty who were interested in asking the hard questions "which go beyond the lines of contemporary fundamentalism."[25] Carnell, no doubt, included himself among the more progressive group since he would not identify himself with the fundamentalists.

As president, Carnell wanted Fuller to maintain the highest standards regarding the credentials of its faculty. They not only had to be quality academic credentials, but the faculty themselves had to show promise of scholarly productivity in their given fields. On top of their scholarly promise, Fuller faculty members should also possess the ability to teach. This concern was echoed by Carnell when he was encouraged to pursue hiring J. Edwin Orr as Professor of Evangelism. Carnell told Ockenga that Orr's big ego may not work well with the Fuller faculty. It did not matter to Carnell that a teacher (such as Orr) be exciting but "he must be able to teach." He goes on to say that "Teaching is an art in itself. Otherwise the man will just tell lovely stories about his campaigns, not getting down to business about evangelism in theory and practice."[26]

---

[25]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, November 9, 1955. Box 35, OP, GC.

[26]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, October 22, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

Both Carl Henry and Harold Lindsell had reservations about Orr as a scholar based upon their remembrances of him as a student at Northern Baptist Seminary. Carnell later relayed to Ockenga that Lindsell had suggested that Orr may have earned his doctorate through "questionable strategies."[27] There was a difference of opinion between Carnell and Ockenga on the qualifications of Orr for the Chair of Evangelism at Fuller. This may have been indicative of the fact that Carnell's perspective was shaped by having consistent contact with the academic world whereas Ockenga's time was taken up with the task of his pastoral duties at Park Street Church in Boston.[28]

As an institution that would be a center for high level evangelical scholarship, Fuller Seminary was equipped to produce the intellectual "blueprints" that would restore western civilization to its biblical foundation.[29] The confidence that Carnell displayed toward the great academic activity of Fuller was at times overshadowed by a sense of disillusionment that the faculty were not producing the

---

[27]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, December 2, 1954; In an earlier letter, Ockenga told Carnell that he did not perceive Orr as "egotistical or arrogant." Orr's education included a Ph.D from Oxford and a Th.D from Northern Baptist, and his doctrine was sound. He believed that Orr was scholarly and well liked by students. see Harold John Ockenga to Edward John Carnell, November 30, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

[28]Ibid.

[29]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, October 22, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

great academic works that were anticipated. No one felt this burden more than Carnell.

> I am distressed about the fact that not all of our men are conscientiously devoting two months each summer to research in their respective fields. . . .Some of the men are going out on Bible Conference circuits and are not even giving evidence of opening a single scholarly book during the whole summer. To me this is as much a violation of the contract with the institution as it would be if the men refused to teach their eight hours.[30]

Carnell felt that the institution deserved the best from its faculty and that there was no excuse for the neglect of their academic responsibilities by booking outside speaking engagements. The greatest violator, according to Carnell, was Charles Woodbridge. Apparently, Wooodbridge was spending more time speaking and ministering in a local Church than he was in his classes at Fuller. Carnell was so vehement about the situation that he wanted to find a way to immediately dissolve the relationship between Woodbridge and the Church.[31] Even Charles Fuller criticized Woodbridge for spending too much time in outside activities. Carnell believed that Dr. Fuller's criticism of Woodbridge resulted in hurt feelings between the two, yet Fuller was not "unjustified in his criticism. Charlie Woodbridge has not characteristically risen to the research opportunities given him at the school."[32] This was especially painful for

---

[30]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, November 28, 1955. Box 35, OP, GC.

[31]Ibid.

Carnell who, after his enthusiastic willingness to lay aside his academic activities for the presidency, began to bemoan the fact that the faculty, who were given the opportunity to produce scholarly work, were squandering it on non-academic activities.[33] This intellectual negligence reflected the greater desire, on the part of a number of new evangelical scholars, to focus their attention on the pastoral needs of the Church at large, rather than the intellectual undercurrents of the day.[34] The frustration that Carnell exhibited over this problem showed that he had a professional attitude about scholarly credibility that many of his peers failed to possess.

The concern over the lackadaisical attitude toward scholarship among some of the Fuller faculty was only one problem that Carnell faced in the battle to make it a center of intellectual credibility. Another major problem for Carnell was the issue of dispensational premillennialism. Dispensationalism had crept into American evangelicalism after the 1870s through the teachings of the Church of Ireland clergyman, John Nelson Darby (1800-1882). Darby was the creator of what some scholars have referred to as a new

---

[32]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, December 2, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

[33]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, March 19, 1956; Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, April 25, 1956. Box 35, OP, GC.

[34]Hatch, "Evangelicalism as a Democratic Movement," p. 79.

kind of "futurist premillennialism" called dispensationalism. It was called dispensationalism because it divided biblical history into time periods, or dispensations. Dispensationalists believed that all "last days" events will come to pass prior to Christ's second advent.[35] Dispensationalism spread like wildfire in America through the Bible school movement and the Bible Conferences that had been established by conservative evangelicals. The most famous of the dispensational popularizers in America was C. I. Scofield who put together the Scofield Reference Bible in 1909. Scofield's system divided biblical history into seven distinct dispensations such as "innocence, conscience, human government, promise, law, grace and kingdom."[36] Up until about the 1860s, American evangelicals had been more familiar with postmillennialism which saw the role of the Church in society as having an active participation in the building of the kingdom of God on earth.[37] By the time that Scofield had established his own

---

[35]Timothy P. Weber, Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), pp. 16-17; Clarence B. Bass, Backgrounds to Dispensationalism: Its Historical Genesis and Ecclesiastical Implications (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977 [1960]), pp. 48-63; Frank, Less Than Conquerors, pp. 69-74; C. Norman Kraus, Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 26-30; Daniel P. Fuller, Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?: The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), pp. 8-17; and Vern S. Poythress, Understanding Dispensationalists (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), pp. 9-18.

[36]Timothy P. Weber, "Dispensationalism," in Daniel G. Reid, ed., Dictionary of Christianity in America, p. 358.

system of premillennialism, American evangelicals had pretty much given up the postmillennial mandate for cultural involvement for a mandate to evangelize the world before the second coming of Christ. This mandate had theological support in the Scofield Reference Bible itself. Out of this came fundamentalism's anti-intellectual, anti-social mindset that the new evangelicals repudiated in their generation. Dispensationalism had become attractive to American fundamentalists since it helped them to make sense of the Scriptures for the purpose of practical application. Two of the more negative features of dispensationalism were that it tended to overemphasize the supernatural aspects of the Scriptures to the extent that it overlooked its historical importance, and that it was attractive to those who were suspicious of scholarship.[38] Dispensationalists like Lewis Sperry Chafer and C. I. Scofield were untrained in the field of theology and biblical studies. Scofield was a lawyer who, after his conversion to Christianity, became a lay scholar with no professional academic training. Chafer, who only had three years of academic study at Oberlin College, remarked in the preface to his multivolume systematic theology that "The very fact that I did not study a prescribed course in theology made it possible for me to approach the subject with an unprejudiced mind to be

---

[37]Marsden, Fundamentalism and American Culture, p. 86.

[38]Noll, Between Faith and Criticism, pp. 58-60.

concerned only with what the Bible actually teaches."[39] These were the words of the founder and president of Dallas Theological Seminary[40], which was further evidence of the fact that many fundamentalist institutions of higher learning were not serious about quality scholarship. It was for these reasons that the new evangelicals wanted to move away from dispensational premillennialism. Most of the new evangelicals who rejected dispensationalism remained

---

[39]Ibid., pp. 59-60; The late Bernard Ramm, who played a significant role in the development of the new evangelicalism, did a comparative analysis of the academic backgrounds of Lewis Sperry Chafer and Karl Barth. Barth has been the object of a great deal of criticism by American evangelicals, particularly those from the dispensational premillennial camp. What Ramm attempts to do is to point out the lack of intellectual credibility of Chafer, whom many evangelicals look to as one of the best examples of evangelical theological scholarship. By way of comparison, Chafer had only three years of college at Oberlin; Barth studied at the universities of Bern, Marburg, Berlin, and Tubingen. He was also awarded over eleven doctorates from major universities. Chafer had no linguistic training, whereas Barth knew Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. He spoke Swiss German, German, English, French, Italian, and Dutch. Chafer had not studied philosophy, but Barth had extensive study in philosophy with Hermann Cohen and Paul Natorp. He interacted with the philosophies of Kant, Kierkegaard, Jaspers, Sartre, and Heidegger. Chafer only interacted with Church history through secondary sources, but Barth studied the Church Fathers in their original language. Ramm also compares the number of times that Chafer and Barth cited Scripture in their respective theological writing. Chafer only cites Scripture eight hundred times in his Systematic Theology compared to the over fifteen thousand citings in Barth's Church Dogmatics. See Ramm, After Fundamentalism, pp. 206-209.

[40]Dallas Theological Seminary is considered to be one of the main bastions of dispensational theology. Lewis Sperry Chafer helped to popularize dispensationalism through his published systematic theology.

committed to moderate forms of premillennialism.[41] Much of what turned the new evangelicals off to dispensationalism was its obsession with eschatology which caused its followers to get caught up into trivial, divisive arguments about the end times. This was in part what caused the fundamentalists of the 1920s and 1930s to fall into intellectual obscurantism. The new evangelical repudiation of dispensationalism was the cause of at least some of the struggle they had with fundamentalists. It was made clear from the beginning of the new evangelical movement that dispensational premillennialism needed to be traversed if there was to be a renewal within evangelicalism. A number of new evangelicals argued that there needed to be more versatility of theological opinion about premillennialism. Carl Henry, who is a premillennialist, was one of the first in his generation to point out that dispensational premillennialism among fundamentalists has caused divisiveness and a turning away from the more serious issues that needed to be addressed.[42] Dispensational theology had failed to show evangelicals how to adequately integrate faith and learning, thus resulting in "a costly historical

---

[41]Millard Erickson, The New Evangelical Theology (Westwood: Revell, 1968), p. 124; George M. Marsden, "From Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism: A Historical Analysis," in David F. Wells and John D. Woodbridge, eds., The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977), p. 149.

[42]Henry, The Uneasy Conscience, pp. 48-57.

toll."[43] George Eldon Ladd, Professor of New Testament theology at Fuller, was another new evangelical critic of dispensationalism, especially the related issues of the second coming of Christ. Dispensationalists had popularized a view which taught that Christians would be raptured away from the earth before a time of horrible suffering known as the great tribulation. Ladd opposed this teaching by arguing that Christians would have to go through the tribulation.[44] What made Ladd's scholarship a cut above most of the preceding fundamentalist scholarship was that he utilized the fruits of modern biblical scholarship in order to draw his conclusions.[45] Ladd's concession to the methodology of modern biblical scholarship certainly gave him and the new evangelical movement more intellectual credibility, but it did not help in winning the affections of the fundamentalists. Carnell's assessment of dispensationalism was tied to his scathing analysis of separatistic fundamentalism. "Dispensationalism filled the vacuum created by the loss of the historic creeds." Dispensationalism, which Carnell associated with fundamentalism, had "withdrawn from the general theological dialogue." The dispensationalist is convinced that his

---

[43]Henry, Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology, p. 36.

[44]George E. Ladd, The Blessed Hope (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956); and George E. Ladd, Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952).

[45]Weber, Living in the Shadow, p. 241.

system is more secure than it really is, hence, he spends his time fighting over minor issues. Dispensationalism, argues Carnell, has made eschatology out to be as important as the "substitutionary atonement."[46] Carnell's dislike for dispensationalism was related more to its abuse by fundamentalists who thought of it as the "only" viable hermeneutical option. He had no problem seeing it as one out of many possible theological options available in the marketplace of truth. At Fuller Seminary, dispensationalism was neither disapproved or approved, but open for critical investigation. The faculty under Carnell's leadership, were free to interpret theology as they saw fit. He only wanted them to be honest with all the facts. In a letter to a concerned constituent of Fuller, Carnell pointedly said that "We are pluralistic here at Fuller. . . .We do not believe that any one theology exhausts the mind of God."[47]

Carnell wanted to build an academic empire with which the world would have to contend. He feared that Fuller would fall into intellectual mediocrity if it continued to embrace in its creed a commitment to premillennialism.[48] But because of its ties to Charles Fuller's radio ministry, "The Old Fashioned Revival Hour," the seminary was going to

---

[46]Carnell, The Case for Orthodox Theology, pp. 117-119.

[47]Edward John Carnell to Harley R. Walker, November 24, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

[48]It should be clarified that Carnell's problem was not so much the issue of premillennialism in and of itself, but rather the "dispensational" version of premillennialism.

be indefinitely shackled to a premillennial position. Tackling the problem, Carnell "persuaded Dr. Fuller to sign a paper (which is in the seminary vault) releasing the institution from any moral obligation to continue its premillennial stand after the cessation of the Old Fashioned Revival Hour." This was good news to Carnell since he was convinced that it was a dreadful mistake for the seminary to be locked into a premillennial commitment.[49] Apparently, Dr. Fuller never signed the paper for Carnell's tone had changed in just a few months. He told Ockenga that "The prospect that the seminary is eternally bound by the creed is an unhappy one from my point of view." He even said that Dr. Fuller insisted "that the seminary be committed to premillennialism." Fuller seminary would never "be a first-rate institution until it enjoys the same liberty in eschatology that classical seminaries have enjoyed hitherto."[50] Part of the problem for Carnell was that Charles Fuller did not possess the technical know-how to deal with the questions of the premillennial issue. He could not seem to communicate to Dr. Fuller the fact that many of the great evangelical predecessors like Warfield, Hodge, and Machen would not be allowed to teach at Fuller since they were not premillennialists. The early Church

---

[49]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, October 14, 1955. Box 35, OP, GC.

[50]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, January 18, 1956. Box 35, op, GC.

Fathers and ninety percent of all the great reformers would not even be welcome at Fuller. Premillennialism, for Carnell, affected one's ability to be a top-rate scholar. He felt that premillennialism limited one's ability to see beyond its reductionistic presuppositions. Carnell referred to Charles Woodbridge as an example of a premillennialist who "will never in all time be a first-rate historian." Fuller seminary was forced to hire a "mediocre premillennialist instead of a top-rate Church historian who is noncommittal on the subject."[51] Carnell's discouragement over the premillennial issue even caused him to say that he would not be interested in continuing as the school's president if it was going to remain committed to premillennialism exclusively. He did "not think a first-rate seminary can be built on a dispensational view of eschatology."[52]

Carnell's concern over the academic mediocrity of his peers also weighed heavily on his mind through the critical years of the new evangelical renaissance. Before his election to the office of president of Fuller, Carnell articulated a clear distinction between his own philosophy of education and that of his peers. Thinking it best to withdraw his own name from consideration for the office of

---

[51]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, March 7, 1956. Box 35, OP, GC.

[52]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, March 19, 1956. Box 35, OP, GC.

president, Carnell told Ockenga that the Fuller faculty wanted the new president to be a kind of "evangelical Dale Carnegie to be a front and public relations man; one who would be `promotionally good for the school; and one who could soak the rich." He was convinced that the faculty did not want the president to be an educator first, but a fund raiser and public relations man. "They want a man who will spark their fantastic dreams of being America's leading evangelicals."

Clearly, Carnell perceived himself as an outsider among his peers because of his vehement opposition to their ideas about education. He often brought up the fact that the Fuller faculty only talked about publishing "world shaking literature" rather than actually proving it. Between the years 1947 and 1954, says Carnell, "not one man on this faculty has published as much as one article in a scholarly journal; let alone publishing a book with a major house. This faculty has an amazing sense of its own virtues. If I were president, I would only irritate them; for I refuse to be party to their fantastic schemes." Carnell was very clear to point out that he was on a different wave length than most of his new evangelical peers. "It is apparent to me, therefore, that I defend a different philosophy of education than do most of my colleagues." His analysis included a scathing indictment against Wilbur Smith, Carl Henry, and Harold Lindsell. Carnell said that Smith "does not think things through very well," and "lives in a dream

world of imagination of scholarship." Carl Henry, had too high of an opinion of Carl Henry, and Harold Lindsell, a great man though he is, "blabs too much."[53] Despite these pointed criticisms, he still managed to eventually become the president of Fuller.

Ockenga had been the acting president until Carnell's election in 1954. This was a big responsibility for Ockenga since he was simultaneously pastoring the Park Street Church in Boston. Carnell's election to the office of president did not come about painlessly. In his work on Fuller Seminary, Marsden discusses how strained Carnell's relationships became after he was elected president. This was particularly true in his relationship to Carl Henry. Henry was older than Carnell and had seniority as a faculty member, yet this did not keep Charles Fuller and Harold Ockenga from placing the presidential crown on Carnell. Marsden raises the question as to why Carnell was chosen over Henry. Henry had administrative experience as the seminary's first dean, and he was an experienced newspaper editor. Dr. Fuller and Ockenga asked Henry what he thought of Carnell for the presidential choice, to which Henry replied that it would be in the seminary's best interest to keep Carnell as a much needed full-time faculty member rather than place him in a situation that would demand an experienced fund-raiser and administrator. Henry thought

---

[53]Edward John Carnell to Harold John Ockenga, September 15, 1954. Box 35, OP, GC.

that an outsider like Frank Gaebelein would be an excellent choice for president. If the board on the other hand was going to settle on an insider, Henry thought Charles Woodbridge would be the best choice. Harold Lindsell and Wilbur Smith were both opposed to Carnell's appointment to the office of president. Smith was especially upset and told Charles Fuller that he believed that Carnell's lack of experience and attitude were potential problems.[54] The negative reaction to Carnell's appointment was more a concern over his lack of experience as a fund-raiser and administrator than it was for his controversial theological outlook. Carnell also realized that he was not cut out to be the president of Fuller. His sense of failure as a fund raiser and a leader in the seminary was inflamed by his failing emotional health. He told Ockenga that he was "a misfit as a president," and that because of his academic temperament he had "no natural desire to command, to assume authority." It was clear that Carnell wanted out of the presidency.[55] Carnell had apparently attempted to resign his office in 1957 but withdrew his resignation from the board of trustees. Much of what caused Carnell to resign was the stress he experienced as a result of the war between fundamentalists and new evangelicals.[56] He was tormented as

---

[54]Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, pp. 141-143.

[55]Quoted in Marsden, Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 173.

[56]Ibid., p. 174.

well by the fact that he was not able to pursue the life of scholarship he so longed to live. Carnell resigned after commencement exercises in May 1959. He would return to his full-time teaching responsibilities in January 1960.[57] Harold Ockenga would for a second time become Fuller's acting president until David Hubbard's election to office in 1963. Carnell's most controversial years came well after his presidential appointment. He would remain at Fuller until his untimely death in 1968.[58]

As we saw in chapter two, Carnell became the most outspoken critic of the separatist fundamentalists who had turned their backs on the sacred task of engaging the modern mind. Strong reaction against Carnell was not limited to the constituency who supported Fuller Seminary. Many of Carnell's colleagues believed that his ideas had done a disservice to the new evangelical cause and to the cause of the seminary. The key players within the new evangelical movement were showing signs of being internally divided, not only over doctrinal issues but also over the question of whether or not they should maintain a commitment to fundamentalism. Marsden has shown that the debate over militancy that drove a wedge between themselves and the

---

[57]Nelson, The Making and Unmaking, p. 106.

[58]It has been speculated that Carnell committed suicide by an overdose of barbiturates. The official death certificate indicates an overdose but as to an intentional suicide there is significant disaggreement. See Nelson, The Making and Unmaking.

separatist fundamentalists was now the debate within their own ranks. "One person's evangelical could be another's fundamentalist."[59] Carnell's intellectual vision was itself the basis for a great deal of the controversy within the new evangelical subculture. His repudiation of fundamentalism (chapter two), though linked to his controversial intellectual vision, was unsettling more so for its shaking of the traditions of fundamentalism.

Carnell's intellectual vision was spelled out in his presidential inaugural address one year after his entrance into office. The title of his address was, "The Glory of a Theological Seminary." He reasoned that the glory of a seminary is in its commitment to its creed, and to its defence of the faith in a way that reflected the credibility.[60] Trouble began with Carnell's statements regarding the necessity of allowing students the freedom to test all truth claims. It is the seminary's responsibility "to acquaint its students with all relevant evidences--damaging as well as supporting --in order the students may be given a reasonable opportunity to exercise their God-given right freely to decide for or against claims to truth." The result of not allowing students the freedom to investigate truth claims may cause them to be victims of "pride, obscurantism, or bigotry." The most problematic

---

[59]Ibid., p 149.

[60]Ibid., p. 148.

statement in his address was his call for students to be tolerant and forgiving of others who disagree them on doctrinal issues.[61] In the year that Carnell had to put together his thoughts for his inaugural address he most likely reflected on his criticism about the negative impact of separatism on the evangelical Church. His comments about the necessity of tolerance and acceptance cut across the very grain of the fundamentalist position on separation and intolerance. Carnell's address caused much consternation within the ranks of the new evangelicals, especially among his colleagues at Fuller. Charles Woodbridge and three others[62] confronted Carnell the day after his address to let him know how displeased they were with his educational philosophy. Woodbridge recounted that Carnell would not retract what he had said in his address. As a result, Woodbridge eventually resigned his post at Fuller.[63]

---

[61]Carnell, "The Glory of a Theological Seminary."

[62]From other sources Marsden says that the other three were Carl Henry, Wilbur Smith, and Harold Lindsell. See Reforming Fundamentalism, p. 149.

[63]Charles Woodbridge, "Reaping the Whirlwind," Christian Beacon (May 5, 1977): 7. As an interesting side note, Woodbridge's account of what Carnell said in his inaugural address is different than what the published address itself says. Woodbridge quoted Carnell as saying, "The Seminary should systematically inculcate on (sic) its students a theology of mutual tolerance and forgiveness toward those who, by reason of their particular doctrinal convictions, stand heretically over against the confessional lines set down by the first Christian community." The published address says, "The seminary inculcate on its students an attitude of tolerance and forgiveness toward individuals whose doctrinal convictions are at variance with those that inhere in the institution itself."

Carnell's position on academic freedom and the question of tolerance placed him light years ahead of most of his colleagues at Fuller. But he did manage to gain support from George Ladd and William LaSor who had already identified themselves outside the constraints of fundamentalism.[64] His vehement commitment to the principles of a progressive educational philosophy were in part a result of his own intellectual pilgrimage from his time as an undergraduate at Wheaton College up through his doctoral studies at Harvard Divinity School. Yet in spite of what appears to have been a great intellectual progression for Carnell, it has been argued that his preparation was inadequate for the task of bringing to the world great new evangelical literature to engage the modern mind. Carnell's entire experience was primarily in theological studies with a philosophical background oriented toward the art of apologetics.[65] He had what Nelson has referred to as "an early modern imagination trying to develop a defense of traditional Christianity in late modern times."[66] This may have been the problem for most every intellectual within the new evangelicalism, yet Carnell's struggle to make relevant the Christian theistic truth claim embodied the realization that there were pieces of the intellectual puzzle missing.

---

[64]Ibid.

[65]Nelson, The Making and Unmaking, p. 217.

[66]Ibid., p. 223.

The most outstanding piece, perhaps, was the lack of academic freedom within the world of evangelical higher education. The negative response that Carnell received is an indicator of how much misunderstanding there was within the new evangelical intellectual community regarding their responsibility in the educational process. The fact that the agenda had been too narrowly focused on theological issues goes without question. It would seem that with all their claims to engaging the modern mind and publishing "World shaking" literature, that the necessity of going beyond the constraints of theology would be obvious. This does not appear to be the case. As we saw earlier, the new evangelicals were sidetracked from many of their aspirations because of their desire to resolve the theological squabbles of fundamentalist predecessors as well as the internal struggles among themselves. It may also be the case that the new evangelicals were themselves out of step with modernity and therefore doomed to repeat many of the errors of their fundamentalist forefathers. The fact that the overwhelming majority of the intellectuals in this generation were theologians may indicate that they were not ready to engage the modern mind. The modern mind had ignored theological squabbles, yet the new evangelicals thought they held the key to answering the hard questions of the day. The vision of Edward Carnell, however, was a tremendous paradigm for the new evangelical generation. His call for tolerance and for the freedom to test all truth claims may have been late

in coming for this generation, yet it helped to lay a foundation for moving the new evangelical intellectual agenda into areas necessary for engaging the modern mind.

SUMMARY

This study has shown that the new evangelicals emerged out of the fundamentalist-modernist debates of the 1920s and 1930s with a specific agenda to reform its anti-social and anti-intellectual tendencies. They demonstrated this desire by attaining Ph.Ds from major research universities including Harvard. The return of these reformed fundamentalists to professional graduate education was a healthy sign of intellectual renewal within the evangelical movement. Once these young scholars finished their educational preparation they commenced to publish books and articles on the failures of establishment fundamentalism in dealing adequately with social and intellectual issues.

The emergence of the new evangelicals paralleled the founding of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) in 1942. The NAE had an agenda to unite fundamentalists and evangelicals from all walks of life in a spirit of love and cooperation. New evangelical scholars such as Carl Henry, Harold Ockenga, and Edward Carnell were more than willing to be associated with the NAE. While it was common for the new evangelicals to repudiate fundamentalism, there eventually developed lack of cohesion among a number of key new evangelical intellectuals. Chapter two has shown that a number of new evangelicals reacted strongly against Carnell's forceful repudiation of fundamentalism. These reactions revealed both a level of discomfort for many new

evangelicals in dispensing with the negative image of fundamentalism, and less than adequate understanding of the new evangelical vision. I have shown that Carnell's vision for the new evangelicalism included a dispensing of what he referred to as "cultic" fundamentalism and a serious attitude toward publishing relevant books on issues of the day. Carnell had a intellectual perspective that was light years ahead of most of his peers, yet he ultimately became the object of criticism from both fundamentalists and new evangelicals.

New evangelical criticism of fundamentalism would not go unanswered by fundamentalists. The repudiation of fundamentalism, and most specifically Carnell's repudiation, helped to usher the new evangelicals into a war of words with fundamentalists that was reminiscent of the earlier fundamentalist-modernist debates. Chapter three shows how time consuming and besetting this war was to the greater intellectual issues that were occupying the minds of the new evangelicals.

I have attempted to show that the new evangelical intellectual agenda to produce scholarly books of "world shaking" proportions was never really realized by this generation. Admittedly, they were successful in bring to evangelicalism a higher level of scholarship than their fundamentalist forefathers had produced, yet the subject matter remained focused on issues pertaining to apologetics and theology. The great works of philosophy and science

were not realized. Perhaps the greatest sense of failure was in the lack of attention that the greater academic community paid to what the new evangelicals were publishing.

I have focused attention on the intellectual example of Edward Carnell. As was previously stated, Carnell was ahead of his time as a scholar in the new evangelical movement. He understood what it would take to make evangelicalism intellectually respectable. He knew as well that the New evangelicalism (as he experienced at Fuller Seminary) must move beyond the various theological and ideological presuppositions that hindered its growth. For Carnell this would include moving beyond the constraints of dispensational theology to a broader perspective that took into consideration a number of theological options. On these issues Carnell continued to receive criticism from his new evangelical peers.

To a large extent, the new evangelicals were sidetracked from many of their intellectual goals. First, they were divided from within as we have seen in their in-house feuding over how far they were to push the repudiation of fundamentalism. A number of admitted new evangelicals, while claiming to renounce the negative image of fundamentalism, spoke of their desire to remain connected to it. Second, the war they waged with fundamentalists had a backfiring effect insofar as it renewed a war that was first fought between fundamentalists and modernists. Instead of being freed up to publish works that would attract the

attention of the greater academic community, new evangelicals spent their time and energy arguing with fundamentalists. Carnell serves as an example of how consumed new evangelicals were by their fight with fundamentalists. And third, the new evangelicals were never really successful at moving beyond the theological issues of the fundamentalist-modernist debate. This was evidenced by the massive amount of time they spent on theological issues, most of which were the same unresolved issues of fundamentalism. This may also be linked to the war that they had fought with fundamentalists.

This study has not attempted to paint with a broad brush by accusing new evangelicals of complete failure. Indeed there have been a number of academic successes by many evangelical scholars in the years following the scope of this study. Fuller Seminary has emerged into a quality academic institution of theological education, as have schools like Wheaton College and Calvin College. These successes are to a large extent due to the path breaking work of the generation on which I have focused. Nevertheless, there are still some major inadequacies in the intellectual standing of American evangelicalism. These inadequacies are a topic for another study that go beyond the constraints of the study under consideration in these pages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Archival Materials

J. Oliver Buswell Papers. Buswell Library of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

Christianity Today Records. Collection 8. Billy Graham Center Archives, Wheaton, Illinois.

V. Raymond Edman Papers. Buswell Library of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

Carl F.H. Henry Papers. Collection 8. Billy Graham Center Archives, Wheaton, Illinois.

Harold John Ockenga Papers. Ockenga Institute, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, Massachusetts.

II. Primary Sources (Books, articles, dissertations and thesis)

Allen, L. H. Bryan and Darrow at Dayton. New York: A. Lee, 1925.

Ashworth, Robert A. "The Fundamentalist Movement Among the Baptists," Journal of Religion 4 (November 1924): 611-631.

Ayer, W. W. God's Answer to Man's Doubts. Grand Rapids:Zondervan, 1943.

Baker, A. L. Creation--Not Evolution. Pacific Press Publishing Company, 1926.

Banks, Howard A. Christ Life or the Word of the Cross: A Devotional Monthly Magazine for Young and Old. Cleveland: Union Gospel Press, March 1925.

Benson, Clarence H. A Popular History of Christian Education. Chicago: Moody Press, 1943.

Bloore, John. Modernism. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1922.

_____. Modernism and its Restatement of Christian Doctrine. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1923.

Brown, Elijah P. The Real Billy Sunday: The Life and Work of Rev. William Ashley Sunday, D.D., The Baseball Evangelist. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1914.

Bryan, William Jennings. The Bible and its Enemies. Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1921.

_____. In His Image. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1922.

_____. "The Fundamentals," The Forum LXX (July 1923):1665-1680.

_____. Orthodox Christianity vs. Modernism. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1924.

Buswell, J. Oliver. "A Christian University or the N.B.I. Plan?" The Bible Today. Published by the National Bible Institute. 38 (March 1944): 156-158.

Carnell, Edward John. An Introduction to Christian Apologetics: A Philosophical Defense of the Trinitarian-Theistic Faith. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

_____. A Philosophy of the Christian Religion. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952.

_____. Christian Commitment: An Apologetic. New York: MacMillan, 1957.

_____. "Fundamentalism," in A Handbook of Christian Theology. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1958.

_____. The Case for Orthodox Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

_____. The Kingdom of Love and the Pride of Life. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961).

Carrara, John. Enemies of Youth. Fundamental Truth Publishers, 1939.

Clark, Gordon H. A Christian View of Men and Things: An Introduction to Philosophy. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952.

Conant, J. E. The Growing Menace of the "Social Gospel". Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1937. Reprinted by Garland Press, 1988.

Dixon, A. C. et al., eds. The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth. 12 vols. Chicago: Testimony Publishing, [1910-1915]. Reprinted by Garland Press, 1988.

Edman, V. Raymond. Out of My Life. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961.

Ellis, William T. "Billy" Sunday: The Man and His Message. Authorized Edition, L.T. Myers, 1914

Ely, James E. Glimpes of Bible Climaxes from the Beginning to the End. Garden City: Businessman's Gospel Association, 1927.

Epp, Theodore H. True Science Agrees with Scripture. Lincoln: Back to the Bible Broadcast, 1953.

Evangelicals Action: A Report of the Organization of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action. Compiled and edited by the executive committee. Boston: United Action Press, 1942.

Evans, William. Personal Soul-Winning. Chicago: Moody Press, 1910,

Fairhurst, A. Atheism in Our Universities. Standard Publishing Company, 1923.

Ferm , Robert O. Cooperative Evangelism: Is Billy Graham Right or Wrong? Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1958.

Forrest, C. L. Do Fundamentalists Play Fair? New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Fosdick, Harry Emerson. "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" A Sermon Preached at the First Presbyterian Church, New York, May 21, 1922. Reprinted by Garland Press, 1988.

Gilbert, Dan. Our Retreat From Modernism. Findlay: Fundamental Truth Company, 1936.

God Hath Spoken: Twenty-Five Addresses Delivered at the World Conference on Christian Fundamentals, May 25 - June 1, 1919. Philadelphia: Bible Conference Committee, 1919. Reprinted by Garland Press, 1988.

Hamilton, Floyd E. The Basis of Christian Faith: A Modern Defense of the Christian Religion. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1923.

Harris, W.S. Mr. World and Miss Church-Member: A Twentieth Century Allegory. G. Holzapfel, 1900.

_____. Sermons by the Devil. Cincinnati: Forshee & Co., 1904.

Henry, Carl F. H. The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947.

_____. The Protestant Dilemma: An Analysis of the Current Impasse in Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.

_____. Contemporary Evangelical Thought. Great Neck: Channel Press, 1957.

_____. Evangelical Responsibility in Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

_____. Evangelicals at the Brink of Crisis. Waco: Word Books, 1967.

_____. Evangelicals in Search of Identity. Waco: Word Books, 1976.

_____. Conversations with Carl Henry: Christianity for Today. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.

Houghton, Will H. The Living Christ and Other Gospel Messages. Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1936.

Hutson, Curtis. New Evangelicalism: An Enemy of Fundamentalism. Murfreesboro: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1984.

Irvine, William C. Heresies Exposed. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1930 [1917].

Johnson, James W. Fundamentalism vs. Modernism. New York: Century Press, 1925.

Kelly, Howard A. A Scientific Man and the Bible. Philadelphia: Sunday School Times, 1925.

Ketcham, Robert T. Facts for Baptists to Face. Waterloo, Iowa, 1942 [1936]. Reprinted by Garland Press, 1988.

_____. The Answer. Chicago: General Association of Regular Baptist Churches, 1950.

Lippman, Walter. A Preface to Morals. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1929.

Lippman, Walter. Drift and Mastery: An Attempt to Diagnose the Current Unrest. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1961 [1914].

Machen, J. Gresham. Christianity and Liberalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946.

Marshall, E. A. Is Christ Coming Before or After the Millennium? Kalamazoo: Tract Evangel Society, 1941.

McIntire, Carl. Twentieth Century Reformation. Collingswood: Christian Beacon Press, 1946.

_____. Servants of Apostasy. Collingswood: Christian Beacon Press, 1955.

McCrossan, T. J. The Bible: Its Christ and Modernism Wheaton: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1929.

McPherson, G.W. The Crisis in the Church. Yonkers, New York, 1919.

Mencken, H.L. Happy Days, 1880-1892. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1940.

Mott, John R. The Evangelization of the World in this Generation. New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1902.

Murch, James Deforest. Cooperation without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. "Fundamentalism," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Edwin R. A. Seligman, ed. vol. 5 New York: MacMillan, 1937.

Ockenga, Harold John, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," Christianity Today (October 10, 1960): 11-15.

Paine, Stephen W., "Separation" is Separating Evangelicals Boston: Fellowship Press, 1951.

Parrott, Leslie. Questionable Things and Places. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1955.

Paulsen, Friedrich. The German Universities and University Study. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Pierson, Arthur T. The Crisis of Missions, or the Voice Out of the Cloud. London: James Nisbet & Company, 1886.

_____. Many Infallible Proofs: The Evidences of Christianity. New York: Fleming Revell, 1886.

Rader, Paul. Paul Rader's Sermons. New York: The Book Stall, 1916.

Ramm, Bernard. The Christian View of Science and Scripture. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

Rice, John R. Verbal Inspiration of the Bible and its Scientific Accuracy Grand Rapids: Zondervan,1943.

_____. God's Cure for Anxious Care. Murfeesburo: Sword of Lord, 1948.

_____. Amusements for Christians: Right or Wrong? Wheaton: Sword of the Lord, 1955.

_____. Is God a "Dirty Bully"? and Other Sensational Sermons. Wheaton: Sword of the Lord, 1958.

Ridout, S. The Bible: The True University. New York: Loizeau Brothers, 1912.

Riley, William B. The Finality of the Higher Criticism or The Theory of Evolution and False Theology. n.p., 1909 [1988].

_____. The Menace of Modernism. New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1917 [1988].

_____. My Bible: An Apologetic. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1937.

Rimmer, Harry. A Consideration of the Credibility of the Chronology of the Bible. Los Angeles: Research Science Bureau, 1929.

_____. The Theory of Evolution and the Facts of Science. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1935.

Scofield, C.I. The New Life in Christ Jesus. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1915.

Scroggie, W. Graham. Is the Bible the Word of God?. Chicago: Moody Press, 1922.

Shields, T.T. The Plot That Failed. Toronto: The Gospel Witness, 1937.

Shipley, Maynard. The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

Smith, Wilbur M. Therefore, Stand: A Plea for a Vigorous Apologetic in the Present Crisis of Evangelical Christianity. Boston: W.A. Wilde, 1945.

_____. This Atomic Age and the Word of God. Boston: W.A. Wilde, 1948.

Stevenson, Herbert F. Keswick's Authentic Voice: Dynamic Addresses Delivered at the Keswick Convention, 1875-1957. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959.

Stonehouse, Ned B. J. Gresham Machen: A Bibographical Memoir. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

Tapper, Ruth M. Lifes Stories of Foreign Missionaries of the Free Methodist Church. Winona Lake: Y.P.M.S. Council, 1935.

Torrey, R.A. Anecdotes and Illustrations. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1907.

_____. The Importance and Value of Proper Bible Study. Chicago: The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1921.

Truett, George W. Some Vital Questions. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1946.

Trumbull, Charles G. Science and the Christian. New York, 1924.

_____. Profecy's Light on Today. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1937.

Tulga, Chester E. The Case Against the Federal Council of Churches. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1948.

_____. The Case Against Communism. Chicago: Good News Publishers, 1949.

_____. The Case Against Modernism. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1949.

_____. The Case Against the Social Gospel. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1949.

_____. The Case Against the World Council of Churches. Chicago Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1949.

_____. The Case Against the National Council of Churches. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951.

_____. The Case Against Modernism in Evangelism. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1952.

_____. The Doctrine of Separation in These Times. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1952.

Walker, Brooks R. The Christian Fright Peddlers. Garden City: Doubleday, 1964.

Willing, J.F. From Fifteen to Twenty-Five: A Book For Young Men. Toronto: International Book and Bible House, 1885.

Woodbridge, Charles. The New Evangelicalism. Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1969.

_____. Campus Crusade Examined in the Light Scripture. Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1970.

Wright, J. Elwin. The Old Fashioned Revival Hour and the Broadcasters. Boston: Fellowship Press, 1940.

III. Select Periodicals

Rather than list each periodical reference, the following list will suffice to provide adequate information regarding each publication and location it was found.

Action. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Baptist Bulletin. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

Bibliotheca Sacra. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Brethren Missionary Herald. Location: Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Bulletin of Wheaton College. Location: Buswell Library Archives, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

Central C. B. Quarterly. Location: Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Ketchum Library, Grand Rapids Baptist College, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Christian Beacon. Location: Personal holdings

Christian Century. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Christian Fundamentalist. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

Christian Herald. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Christian Life. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Christianity Today. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Discerner. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Eternity. Location: Personal Holdings.

Evangelical Beacon. Location: Personal Holdings.

King's Business. Location: Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Il.

Moody Monthly. Locations: Buswell Library, Wheaton a College, Wheaton, Illinois; William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Reformation Review. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

Revelation. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Serving and Waiting. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

Signs of the Times. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

Sword of the Lord. Location: Personal holdings.

Sunday School Times. Location: Buswell Library, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois.

Voice. Location: William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Watchman-Examiner. Location: Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

IV. Secondary Sources (Books, articles, dissertations, thesis)

Ahlstrom, Sidney E. A Religious History of the American People. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. and Robert Bruce Mullin. The Scientific Theist: A Life of Francis Ellingwood Abbot. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.

Allen, Rodger Van., ed. American Religious Values and the Future of America. Philadelphia: Fortress Press,1978.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. Bible Believers: Fundamentalism in the Modern World. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Ariel, Yaakov. On Behalf of Israel: American Fundamentalist Attitudes Toward Jews, Judaism, and Zionism, 1865-1945. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991.

Ashbrook, William A. Evangelicalism: The New Neutralism. Columbus: Calvary Bible Church, 1970).

Averill, Lloyd J. Religious Right, Religious Wrong: A Critique of the Fundamentalist Phenomenon. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989.

Bailey, Kenneth K. Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Baldwin, Leland D. The American Quest for the City of God. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1981.

Balmer, Randall. Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Baritz, Loren. The Good Life: The Meaning of Success for the American Middle Class. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.

Barnhart, Joe Edward. The Southern Baptist Holy War. Austin: Texas Monthly Press, 1986.

Barr, James. Fundamentalism. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.

Barzun, Jacques. The House of Intellect. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Bass, Clarence B. Backgrounds to Dispensationalism: Its Historical Genesis and Ecclesiastical Implications. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.

Bauman, Michael. Pilgrim Theology: Taking the Path of Theological Discovery. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Bebbington, David. Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, A History from the 1730s to the 1980s. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992 [1989].

Beck, W. David, ed. Opening the American Mind: The Integration of Biblical Truth in the Curriculum of the University. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.

Bellah, Robert, et al. Habits of the Heart: Individualismand Commitment in American Life. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

Bennett, David H. The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Religious Right in American History. New York: Vintage Books, 1988.

Benware, Paul. "The Social Responsibility of the Church," Grace Journal 12 (Winter 1971): 3-17.

Bledstein, Burton J. The Culture of Professionalization: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America. New York: Norton, 1976.

Bloesch, Donald G. The Evangelical Renaissance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.

_____. The Future of Evangelical Christianity: A Call for Unity Amid Diversity. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

_____. Crumbling Foundations: Death and Rebirth in an Age of Upheaval. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

Bloch, Ruth A. Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Bloom. Harold. The American Religion: The Emergence of the Post-Christian Nation. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.

Boardman, Fon W., Jr. America and the Progressive Era, 1900-1917. New York: Henry Z. Walck, 1970.

Bolich, Gregory G. Karl Barth and Evangelicalism. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1980.

Boller, Paul F., Jr. American Thought in Transition: The Impact of Evolutionary Naturalism, 1865-1900. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Boone, Kathleen C. The Bible Tells Them So: The Discourse of Protestant Fundamentalism. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Borgmann, Albert. Crossing the Postmodern Divide. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Boylan, Anne M. Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution, 1790-1880. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious thought. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.

Braeman, John, et al., eds. Change and Continuity in Twentieth-Century America. Ohio State University Press, 1964.

Bratt, James D. Dutch Calvinism in Modern America: A History of a Conservative Subculture. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

Brereton, Virginia Lieson. Training God's Army: The American Bible School, 1880-1940. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Brown, Jerry Wayne. The Rise of Biblical Criticism in America, 1800-1870. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Brubacher, John S. and William Rudy. Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1976. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Bruce, Steve. Pray TV: Televangelism in America. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Bryant, M. Darrol and Donald W. Dayton, eds., The Coming Kingdom: Essays in American Millennialism & Eschatology. Barrytown: International Religious Foundation, 1983.

Bull, Malcolm and Keith Lockhart. Seeking a Sanctuary: Seventh-Day Adventism and the American Dream. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Butler, Jonathan M. Softly and Tenderly Jesus is Calling: Heaven and Hell in American Revivalism, 1870-1920. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing,1991.

Cairns, Earle E. V. Raymond Edman: In the Presence of the King. Chicago: Moody Press, 1972.

Carpenter, Joel Allan. "The Renewal of American Fundamentalism, 1930-1945." Ph.D dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1984.

_____ and Kenneth W. Shipps, et al., eds. Making Higher Education Christian: The History and Mission of Evangelical Colleges in America. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____ and Wilbert R. Shenk, et al., eds. Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Cerillo, Augustus, Jr., Murray W. Dempster. Salt and Light: Evangelical Political Thought in Modern America. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

_____. "Carl F. H. Henry's Early Apologetic for an Evangelical Social Ethic, 1942-1956," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 34 (September 1991): 365-379.

Clendenin, Daniel B. and W. David Buschart, eds., Scholarship, Sacraments and Service: Historical Studies in Protestant Tradition: Essays in Honor of Bard Thompson. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990).

Coben, Stanley. Rebellion Against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Cohen, Norman J. The Fundamentalist Phenomenon: A View From Within, a Response From Without. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Cole, Stewart G. The History of Fundamentalism. Hamden: Archon Books, 1963.

Commager, Henry Steele. The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character Since the 1880s. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Cooper, John Milton, Jr. Pivotal Decades: The United States, 1900-1920. New York: Norton, 1990.

Cox, Harvey. Religion in the Secular City: Toward a Postmodern Theology. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

Criswell, W.A. Why I Preach That the Bible is Literally True. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1969.

Davis, John Jefferson. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Dayton, Donald W. Theological Roots of Pentecostalism. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.

_____. Discovering an Evangelical Heritage. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988.

_____, Robert K. Johnston, et al., eds. The Variety of American Evangelicalism. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1991.

Dobson, Ed, et al. The Fundamentalist Phenomenon: The Resurgence of Conservative Christianity. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.

Dollar, George W. A History of Fundamentalism in America. Orlando: Daniels Publishing, 1983.

_____. The Fight for Fundamentalism: American Fundamentalism, 1973-1983. Orlando: Daniels Publishing, 1983.

Dorough, C. Dwight. The Bible Belt Mystique. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Dorsett, Lyle W. Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Dyrness, William A. How Does America Hear the Gospel? Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Eckardt, A. Roy. The Surge of Piety in America. New York: Association Press, 1958.

Eighmy, John Lee. Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987.

Ellis, William E. "Frank LeRond McVey: His Defense of Academic Freedom," Register of the Kentucky Historical Society 67 (January 1969): 37-54.

_____. "Evolution, Fundamentalism, and the Historians: An Historiographical Review." The Historian, XLIV (November 1981): 15-35.

_____. A Man of Books and a Man of the People. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.

Epler, Stephen Edward. Honorary Degrees: A Survey of Their Use and Abuse. Washington D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1943.

Erickson, Millard J. The New Evangelical Theology. Westwood: Fleming Revell, 1968.

Evans, Ron L., Irwin M. Berent. Fundamentalism: Hazards and Heartbreaks. LaSalle: Open Court, 1988.

Farmer, James Oscar, Jr. The Metaphysical Confederacy: James Henley Thornwell and the Synthesis of Southern alues. Macon: Mecer University Press, 1986.

Farrow, Douglas. The Word of Truth and Disputes about Words. Winona Lake: Carpenter Books, 1987.

Findlay, James F. Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist, 1837-1899. Chicago: Baker, 1973.

Flake, Carol. Redemptorama: Culture, Politics, and the New Evangelicalism. Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.

Fowler, Robert Booth. A New Engagement: Evangelical Political Thought, 1966-1976. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Frank, Douglas W. Less Than Conquerors: How Evangelicals Entered the Twentieth Century. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Fraser, James W. Schooling the Preachers: The Development of Protestant Theological Education in the United States, 1740-1875. Lanham: University Press of America, 1988.

Fuller, Daniel P. Give the Winds a Mighty Voice: The Story of Charles E. Fuller. Waco: Word Books, 1972.

_____. Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum?: The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Furniss, Norman F. The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931. Hamden: Archon Books, 1963.

Gabriel, Ralph Henry. Religion and Learning at Yale: The Church of Christ in the College and University, 1757-1957. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Garrett, James Leo, Jr., E. Glenn Hinson, James E. Tull. Are Southern Baptists "Evangelicals"? Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983.

Gasper, Louis. The Fundamentalist Movement, 1930-1956. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Gatewood, Willard B., Jr. Controversy in the Twenties: Fundamentalism, Modernism, and Evolution. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1969.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Getz, Gene A. MBI: The Story of Moody Bible Institute. Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.

Glad, Paul W. The Trumpet Soundeth: William Jennings Bryan and His Democracy, 1896-1912. Omaha: University of Nebraska Press, 1960.

Gorrell, Donald K. The Age of Social Responsibility: The Social Gospel in the Progressive Era, 1900-1920. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.

Graener, William. The Age of Doubt: American Thought and Culture in the 1940s. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.

Hakes, J. Edward, ed. An Introduction to Evangelical Christian Education. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964.

Hammond, Phillip E. "In Search of a Protestant Twentieth Century: American Religion and Power Since 1900,"Review of Religious Research, 24 (June 1983): 281-294.

Handy, Robert T. A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Hankins, Barry. "The Strange Career of J. Frank Norris: Or, Can a Baptist Democrat Be a Fundamentalist Republican?"Church History 61 (September 1992): 373-392.

Harrell, David Edwin, Jr., ed. Varieties of Southern Evangelicalism. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1981.

_____. Oral Roberts: An American Life. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Harrington, Carol E. "The Fundamentalist Movement in America, 1870-1920." Ph.D dissertation, University of California, 1959.

Harrington, Michael. The Politics at God's Funeral: The Spiritual Crisis of Western Civilization. New York: Penguin Books, 1983.

Hart, Darryl Glenn. " 'Doctor Fundamentalis': An Intellectual Biography of J. Gresham Machen, 1881-1937." Ph.D dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1988.

Hatch, Nathan O., Mark A. Noll, et al., eds. The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

_____. The Democratization of American Christianity. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Henry, Carl F. H. "The Christian Scholar's Task in a Stricken World," Christian Scholar's Review 17 (June 1988): 474-488.

Herbst, Jurgen. The German Historical School in American Scholarship. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Higham, John. "Hanging Together: Divergent Unities in American History," Journal of American History, LXI (June 1974): 5-28.

Hill, Samuel S., Jr. Southern Churches in Crisis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Hoeveler, J. David, Jr. The New Humanism: A Critique of Modern America, 1900-1940. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977.

Hofstadter, Richard, C. Dewitt Hardy, eds. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

_____. Social Darwinism in American Thought. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

_____. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

_____. The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

_____. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

_____, ed. The Progressive Movement, 1900-1915. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

_____. "The Revolution in Higher Education," in Paths of American Thought, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

Hoge, Dean R. Commitment on Campus: Changes in Religion and Values Over Five Decades. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.

Holifield, E. Brooks. The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860. Durham: Duke University Press, 1978.

_____. A History of Pastoral Care in America: From Salvation to Self-Realization Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983.

Holmes, Arthur F. The Idea of a Christian College. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

_____., ed. The Making of a Christian Mind: A Christian World View & the Academic Enterprise. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1985.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Horton, Michael Scott. Made in America: The Shaping of Modern American Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.

Howard, David M. The Dream that would not Die: The Birth and Growth of the World Evangelical Fellowship, 1846-1986. Paternoster Press/World Evangelical Fellowship, 1986.

Hudson, Winthrop S. Religion in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1981.

Hughes, Richard T., ed. The American Quest for the Primitive Church. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Hunt, Keith and Gladys. For Christ and the University: The Story of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship of the U.S.A./1940-1990. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991.

Hunter, James Davison. American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983.

_____. Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

_____. Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Hutchison, William R. The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

_____, ed. Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Jarrett, Derek. The Sleep of Reason: Fantasy and Reality From the Victorian Age to the First World War. New York: Harper & Row, 1989.

Jencks, Christopher, David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969.

Johnston, Robert K. Evangelicals at an Impasse: Biblical Authority in Practice. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.

_____., ed. The Use of the Bible in Theology/Evangelical Options. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.

Jorstad, Erling. The Politics of Doomsday: Fundamentalists of the Far Right. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

_____. "Two on the Right: A Comparative Look at Fundamentalism and New Evangelicalism," Lutheran Quarterly 23 (May 1971): 107-117.

Kantzer, Kenneth S., ed. Evangelical Roots: A Tribute to Wilbur Smith. Nashville: Nelson, 1978.

Kay, Thomas O. The Christian Answer to Communism: The Popular NAE Study Guide. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961,

Killen, R. Allen. "The Inadequacy of the New Evangelicalism and the Need for a New and Better Method," Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 19 (Spring 1976): 113-120.

Kraus, C. Norman. Dispensationalism in America: Its Rise and Development. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1958.

Kuenning, Paul P. The Rise and Fall of American Lutheran Pietism. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.

Kuklick, Bruce. The Rise of American Philosophy: Cambridge, Massachusettes, 1860-1930. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lacey, Michael J., ed. Religion and Twentieth-Century Intellectual Life. Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Lasch, Christopher. The New Radicalism in America, 1889-1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type. New York: Knopf, 1965.

_____. The True and Only Heaven: Progress and its Critics. New York: W. W. Norton, 1991.

Lawrence, Bruce B. Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt Against the Modern Age. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.

Leonard, Bill J. God's Last and Only Hope: The Fragmentation of the Southern Baptist Convention. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Levine, Lawrence W. Defender of the Faith William Jennings Bryan: The Last Decade, 1915-1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Liebman, Robert C., Robert Wuthnow, eds. The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation. New York: Aldine Publishing, 1983.

Lightner, Robert P. Neo-Evangelicalism. Findlay: Dunham Publishing, 1962.

_____. "The New Evangelicals - Bystanders of the Faith," Discerner. Part 1 in Volume 6 (July-September 1969): 4-10. Part 2 in volume 6 (October-December 1969): 7-10.

Lindberg, David C., Ronald L. Numbers, eds. God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter Between Christianity and Science. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Lindsell, Harold. The Battle for the Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.

Livingstone, David N. Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: The Encounter Between Evangelical Theology and Evolutionary Thought. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Lotz, David W., ed. Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America. 1935-1985. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Lovelace, Richard F. Dynamics of Spiritual Life: An Evangelical Theology of Renewal. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979.

McDannell, Colleen. The Christian Home in Victorian America, 1840-1900. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Magnuson, Norris. Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work, 1865-1920. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.

Malik, Charles Habib. A Christian Critique of the University. Downers Grover: InterVarsity Press, 1982.

Marsden, George M. Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

_____. ed. Evangelicalism and Modern America. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

_____. Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. "Evangelicals and the Scientific Culture: An Overview," in Religion and Twentieth-Century American Intellectual Life, Michael J. Lacey ed., Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and Cambridge University Press, 1989.

_____. Religion and American Culture. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990.

_____. Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

_____. "The Soul of the American University," Faculty Dialogue 15 (Fall 1991): 83-118.

_____ and Bradley L. Longfield, eds. The Secularization of the Academy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Marty, Martin E. "Intruders in the Crowed Center," Christian Century 74 (July 3, 1957): 820-821.

_____. "Fundamentalism and the Church," Christian Century 74 (November 27, 1957): 1411-1413.

Marty, Martin E. A Nation of Behavers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

_____. Modern American Religion: The Irony of it All, 1893-1919. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986, Volume 1.

_____. Modern American Religion: The Noise of Conflict, 1919-1941. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, Volume 2.

_____, and R. Scott Appleby. The Glory and the Power: The Fundamentalist Challenge to the Modern World. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.

Masoner, David J. "What 'Christian' Higher Education Means: Philosophy, Process, and Product," Faculty Dialogue 9 (Fall 1987): 7-13.

Massa, Mark S. Charles Augustus Briggs and the Crisis of Historical Criticism. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

May, Henry F. The End of American Innocence: A Study of the First Years of Our Own Time, 1912-1917. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

_____. Protestant Churches and Industrial America. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

_____. Ideas, Faiths and Feelings: Essays on American Intellectual and Religious History, 1952-1982. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Mayers, Marvin K., Lawrence Richards, and Robert Webber. Reshaping Evangelical Higher Education. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972.

Mead, Sidney, E. The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

_____. The Nation with the Soul of a Church. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985 [1975].

Mecklin, John Moffatt. The Survival Value of Christianity. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1926.

Miller, Perry. Errand into the Wilderness. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Moore, R. Laurence. Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Nash, Roderick. The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970.

Nash, Ronald H. The New Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963.

_____., ed. The Philosophy of Gordon H. Clark: A Festschrift. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1968.

_____. Evangelicals in America: Who They Are, What They Believe. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987.

Nelson, Rudolph. The Making and Unmaking of an Evangelical Mind: The Case of Edward Carnell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

_____. "Fundamentalism at Harvard: The Case of Edward John Carnell," Quarterly Review 2 (Summer 1982): 79-98.

Neuhaus, Richard John, Michael Cromartie, eds. Piety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World. Washington D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1987.

Newbigin, Lesslie. Foolishness to the Greeks: The Gospel and Western Culture. Grand Rapids: Eerdman, 1986.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Kingdom of God in America. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1937.

_____. Christ and Culture. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

_____. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: Living Age Books, 1958.

Noll, Mark A., ed. The Princeton Theology, 1812-1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

_____. "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought." American Quarterly 37 (Summer 1985): 216-238.

_____. Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

_____, and David F. Wells, eds., Christian Faith and Practice in the Modern World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

_____. A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Numbers, Ronald L. The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism. New York: Knopf, 1992.

Ownby, Ted. Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation, and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Patterson, Bob E. Carl F. H. Henry. "Makers of the Modern Theological Mind Series." Waco: Word Books, 1983.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Intellectual. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Perry, Lewis. Intellectual Life in America. New York: Franklin Watts, 1984.

_____. Boats Against the Current: American Culture Between Revolution and Modernity, 1820-1860. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Peterson, Michael L. Philosophy of Education: Issues and Options. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1986.

Plantinga, Alvin, Nicholas Walterstorff, eds. Faith and Rationality: Reason and Belief in God. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.

Postman, Neil. Conscientious Objections: Stirring up Trouble About Language, Technology, and Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1988.

_____. Technopoloy: The Surrender of Culture to Technology. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.

Poythress, Vern S. Understanding Dispensationalism. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.

Price, Robert M. "Neo-Evangelicals and Scripture: A Forgotten Period of Ferment," Christian Scholar's Review 15 (1986): 315-330.

Pyles, Volie E. "Bruised, Bloodied, and Broken': Fundamentalism's Internecine Controversy in the 1960s," Fides et Historia 18 (October 1986): 45-55.

Quebedeaux, Richard. The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

_____. The Worldly Evangelicals. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

Ramm, Bernard. The Christian College in the Twentieth Century. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.

_____. The Evangelical Heritage: A Study in Historical Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 [1973].

_____. After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

Ramsey, Paul, John F. Wilson, eds. The Study of Religion in Colleges and Universities. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. The Making of the Modern Mind: A Survey of the Intellectual Background of the Present Age. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1940.

Reid, Daniel G. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

Rifkin, Jeremy and Ted Howard. The Emerging Order: God in an Age of Scarcity. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons,1979.

Ringenberg, William C. Taylor University: The First 125 Years. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.

_____. The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

Rogers, Jack and Donald McKim. The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Rosas, Joseph L. III. "The Theology of Edward John Carnell," Criswell Theological Review 4 (Spring 1990): 351-371.

Rosenau, Pualine Marie. Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads and Intrusions. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

Rosenberg, Ellen M. The Southern Baptists: A Subculture in Transition. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

Rudnick, Milton L. Fundamentalism and the Missouri Synod: A Historical Study of Their Interaction and Mutual Influence. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Knopf, 1962.

Russell, C. Allyn. Voices of American Fundamentalism: Seven Biographical Studies. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Sandeen, Ernest R. "Toward a Historical Interpretation of the Origins of Fundamentalism," Church History, 36 (March 1967): 66-83.

_____. The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Scorgie, Glen G. A Call for Continuity: The Theological Contribution of James Orr. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.

Schultze, Quentin J., ed. American Evangelicals and the Mass Media. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

_____. Televangelism and American Culture: The Business of Popular Religion. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991.

Sell, Alan P. F. Theology in Turmoil: The Roots, Course and of the Conservative-Liberal Debate in Modern Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.

Shelley, Bruce L. Evangelicalism in America. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967. Baker, 1991.

Shepard, Robert S. God's People in the Ivory Tower: Religion in the Early American University. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991.

Shippey, Frederick A. Protestantism in Suburban Life. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964.

Silk, Mark. Spiritual Politics: Religion and America Since World War II. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.

Smith, Gary Scott. The Seeds of Secularization: Calvinism, Culture, and Pluralism in America, 1870-1915. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

Smith, Timothy L. Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

_____. "The Evangelical Kaleidoscope and the Call to Christian Unity," Christian Scholar's Review 15 (1986): 125-140.

Stackhouse, John G., Jr. "Who Follows in His Train?' Edward John Carnell as a Model for Evangelical Theology," Crux 21 (June 1985): 19-27.

Stevenson, Louise L. Scholarly Means to Evangelical Ends: The New Haven Scholars and the Transformation of Higher Learning in America, 1830-1890. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Stevik, Daniel B. Beyond Fundamentalism. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964.

Stonehouse, Ned B. J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1954.

Stout, Harry S. The Divine Dramatist: George Whitefield and the Rise of Modern Evangelicalism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Strout, Cushing, ed. Intellectual History in America: From Darwin to Niebuhr. New York: Harper & Row, 1968. Vol. 2.

Susman, Warren I. Culture as History: The Transformation of American Society in the Twentieth Century. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Sweeney, Douglas A. "Fundamentalism and the Neo-Evangelicals," Fides et Historia 24 (Winter/Spring 1992): 81-96.

Sweet, Leonard, ed. The Evangelical Tradition in America. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1984.

Sweet, William Warren. Revivalism in America: Its Origin, Growth, and Influence. New York: Abingdon Press, 1944.

Synan, Vinson. The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Szasz, Ferenc Morton. The Divided Mind of Protestant America, 1880-1930. University: University of Alabama Press, 1982.

Thompson, James J., Jr. Tried as by Fire: Southern Baptists and the Religious Controversies of the 1920s. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1982.

Trembath, Kern Robert. Evangelical Theories of Biblical Inspiration: A Review and Proposal. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Trollinger, William Vance, Jr. God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.

Turner, James. Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee. Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Varghese, Roy Abraham, ed., The Intellectuals Speak Out About God. Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1984.

Veysey, Lawrence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wacker, Grant. Augustus H. Strong and the Dilemma of Historical Consciousness. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.

_____. "The Holy Spirit and the Spirit of the Age in American Protestantism, 1880-1910," Journal of American History, 72 (June 1985): 45-62.

Wall, James M, ed. Theologians in Transition: The Christian Century "How My Mind Has Changed" Series. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

Watt, David Harrington. A Transforming Faith: Explorations of Twentieth-Century American Evangelicalism. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Weber, Timothy P. Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1982. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

_____. "Finding Someone to Blame: Fundamentalism and Anti-Semitic Conspiracy Theories in the 1930s," Fides et Historia 24 (Summer 1992): 40-55.

Wells, David F. and John D. Woodbridge, eds., The Evangelicals: What They Believe, Who They Are, Where They Are Changing. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975.

Wenger, Robert E. "Social Thought in American Fundamentalism." Ph.D dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1973.

Wesche, Lilburn E. "Can the Christian College Educate?" Faculty Dialogue 13 (Winter 1990): 35-41.

White, Edward A. Science and Religion in American Thought: The Impact of Naturalism. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952.

White, Morton. Pragmatism and the American Mind: Essays and Reviews in Philosophy and Intellectual History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Wiebe, Robert H. The Search for Order, 1877-1920. New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

Wilkes, Peter, ed. Christianity Challenges the University. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1981.

Wilson, John F. Public Religion in American Culture. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979.

Woodbridge, John D., Mark A. Noll, Nathan O. Hatch, et al., eds. The Gospel in America: Themes in the story of America's Evangelicals. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.

Wuthnow, Robert. The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

_____. The Struggle for America's Soul: Evangelicals, Liberals, and Secularism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.